



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

872,518

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

80035
VOL. XXXVIII.

PUBLISHED IN
MARCH AND JUNE, 1855.



LONDON:
THOMAS RICHARDSON AND SON,
172, FLEET STREET; 9, CAPEL STREET, DUBLIN; AND DERBY.
MARSH & BEATTIE, EDINBURGH; HUGH MARGEY, GLASGOW.
NEW YORK: EDWARD DUNIGAN AND BROTHER, 151, FULTON STREET.
PARIS: 9, RUE DU COQ, NEAR THE LOUVRE, STASSIN AND XAVIER.

—
1855.

CONTENTS OF No. LXXV.

ART.	PAGE
I.—1. Gosselin's Power of the Popes in the Middle Ages. London: Dolman, 1854.	
2. Roscoe's Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and Leo X. London: Bohn, 1853.	
3. Life of Savonarola. By DR. MADDEN. London: Newby, 1853.	
4. Ranke's History of the Popes. London: Bohn, 1853.	
5. Machiavelli's History of Florence. London: Bohn, 1851. 	2
II.—Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Prin- cesses connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain. By AGNES STRICKLAND, Author of "Lives of Queens of England." Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Son, 1854. 	73
III.—1. Fresenius' Instructions in Chemical Analyses. Lon- don: Churchill.	
2. Galloway's Manual of Qualitative Analyses. Lon- don: Churchill.	
3. Abel and Bloxam's Handbook of Chemistry. London: Churchill.	
4. Faraday's Lectures. London: Longmans, ...	98
IV.—1. The Natural History of Creation. By T. LINDLEY KEMP. London: Longmans, 1852.	
2. Indications of Instinct. By T. LINDLEY KEMP; being Nos. 24 and 54 of the "Traveller's Library." London: Longmans, 1854. 	113
V.—The Druses of the Lebanon. Their Manners, Cus- toms, and History. With a translation of their Religious Code. By GEORGE WASHINGTON CHAS- SEAUD, late of Beyrout, Syria. London: Bentley, 1855. 	120

CONTENTS.

ART.		PAGE
VI.—1.	The Chinese Empire ; forming a Sequel to the Work entitled, "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet." By M. HUC, formerly Missionary Apostolic in China. 2 vols. 8vo. London : Longmans, 1855.	
2.	History of the Insurrection in China ; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents. By MM. CALLERY and IVAN. 8vo. London : Smith, Elder, and Co., 1853.	
3.	Discoveries in Chinese ; or the Symbolism of the Primitive Characters of the Chinese System of Writing. By STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS. 8vo. New York : Norton, 1854.	134
VII.—	Descartes on Method. Edinburgh : Sutherland and Knox ; London : Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1852.	169
VIII.—	A Bill to Promote Education in England, (prepared and brought in by LORD JOHN RUSSELL and MR. HASTINGS.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 8 February, 1855.	212
IX.—1.	The History of the Early Puritans ; from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London : Hamilton, Adams, and Co., 1853.	
2.	The History of Later Puritans ; from the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642, to the Ejection of the non-conforming Clergy in 1662. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London : Hamilton, Adams and Co, 1854.	
3.	Origin and Development of Anglicanism ; or a History of the Litanies, Homilies, Articles, Bibles, Principles, and Governmental System of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. WATERWORTH, S.J. London : Burns and Lambert, 1854.	
4.	A History of the Articles of Religion. By CHARLES HARDWICKE, M.A. 8vo. Cambridge : Deighton, 1851.	
5.	A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices. By Rev. FRANCIS PROCTER, M.A. 8vo. Cambridge : McMillan and Co., 1855.	232

CONTENTS OF No. LXXVI.

ART.	PAGE
<p>I.—History of the United States of America, from the Discovery of the American Continent. By George Bancroft. London : Routledge and Co., 1851.</p>	273
<p>II.—Poems. By Aubrey de Vere. Post 8vo. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855. </p>	300
<p>III.—1. Memoirs of the Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil. By W. Torrens McCullagh, Author of "The Industrial History of free Nations," &c., &c. 2 vols. London : Colburn, 1855.</p> <p>2. Sketches Legal and Political. By the late Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil, edited, with Notes, by M. W. Savage, Esq. 2 vols. London : Colburn, 1855.</p> <p>3. Sketches of the Irish Bar ; with other Literary and Political Essays. By William Henry Curran, Esq., 2 vols. 8vo. London, Colburn, 1855, </p>	321
<p>IV.—1. Lingard's History of England ; St. Thomas of Can- terbury. Vols. 1—3. Sixth Edition. London : Dolman, 1855.</p> <p>2. Roger of Wendover's Chronicles. London : Bohn. 1853, </p>	355
<p>V.—The Life, Times, and Contemporaries of Lord Clon- curry. By William John Fitzpatrick. Member of the Royal Dublin Society. Dublin : James Duffy, 1855, </p>	413

CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
VI.—1. Mahometanism in its Relation to Prophecy, or an Inquiry into the Prophecies concerning Antichrist, with some reference to their bearing on the events of the present day. By Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, Esq., of Grace Dieu Manor, Leicestershire. London: Dolman, 1855.	
2. Apocalyptic Sketches. By the Rev. Dr. Cumming. London: Hall and Virtue, 1854.	
3. The Apocalypse Fulfilled, or an Answer to Apocalyptic Sketches. By Dr. Cumming. By the Rev. P. S. Desprez, B. D., &c. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman's, 1854.	
4. An Argument for the Neronic date of the Apocalypse, from Internal Evidence. By the Rev. P. S. Desprez. London: Walton and Mitchel, 1855.	
5. Lectures on the History of the Turks. By the author of "Loss and Gain." Dublin: Duffy, 1854,	... 424
VII.—Sisters of Charity Catholic and Protestant, Abroad and at Home. By Mrs. Jameson. London: Longman, 1855,	... 442
VIII.—1. Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Management and Government of the College of Maynooth. Part I. Report and Appendix. Dublin, 1855.	
2. Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Management and Government of the College of Maynooth. Part II. Minutes of Evidence. Dublin, 1855,	... 461
IX.—The Blessed Sacrament, or the Works and Ways of God. By Frederick William Faber, D. D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1855,	... 507

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

MARCH, 1855.

ART. I.—1. *Gosselin's Power of the Popes in the Middle Ages.* London: Dolman, 1854.

2. *Roscoe's Lives of Lorenzo de Medici and Leo X.* London: Bohn, 1853.

3. *Life of Savonarola.* By Dr. MADDEN. London: Newby, 1853.

4. *Ranke's History of the Popes.* London: Bohn, 1853.

5. *Machiavelli's History of Florence.* London: Bohn, 1851.

TO CATHOLICS there can scarcely be a subject of deeper interest than the character and the conduct of the Vicars of Christ—especially during the periods for which they respectively occupied the Chair of St. Peter: not because, as Protestants often ignorantly imagine, that the personal character of Pontiffs can possibly affect the argument as to their divine mission and supremacy, but because the question is one at all events of a painful and sorrowful scandal, which it must surely be, to a truly Catholic mind, a joy to be in any degree able to remove. And even apart indeed from any peculiar interest which Catholics cannot but feel in the question, it has an attraction of its own, founded on the noblest and most generous feelings of nature, which delight in the rescue of any great character from the rancorous tooth of calumny. As it is one of the meanest and most malignant tendencies of the human mind which disposes it to pharisaical detraction or slanderous denunciations, so it is an instinct of justice which should never be neglected, and a dictate of charity which should ever be cherished—to vindicate the victims of calumny, and rescue them from their load of unmerited obloquy. It is a noble exercise of intellect to dissect the fabrications of malignant falsehood, and destroy the in-

ventions of hate, and it is one in which as Protestant authors have engaged in the generous spirit of chivalry, so any Catholic writer should be, under the sacred influence of charity, happy to enlist his utmost energies. Above all, it should be so in the instance of any who have sat on that sacred seat with which to associate aught of scandal or of shame must bring grief to the Catholic heart. And as in those ages in the history of the Church in which iniquity has abounded, and the "love of many has waxed cold," there have not been wanting parricidal children who have joined with her enemies to spoil and assail her, and to excuse or cloak their own iniquity, by impiety to her supreme Pontiffs, there are some of the Vicars of Christ whose characters have come down to us so blackened with calumny that candid Catholics and enlightened Protestants generally are equally ready to hold them up to execration as "bad Popes." On the Continent Catholic intellect has for some time been devoted to the noble duty of defending the calumniated Pontiffs. Gregory VII., who had long laboured under a load of obloquy, has been triumphantly vindicated. Hurter has done a similar glorious service to the memory of Innocent VIII. Catholic historians have done much, if not enough to place in its true light the conduct and the fate of that unhappy victim of a despot's violence, Boniface VIII. And even in our own days, for that most maligned of Pontiffs, Alexander VI., there have not been wanting illustrious sons of the Catholic Church, not in Italy, but in Germany or France, who have, (we refer to the words of Rohrbacher and Jorry) in the true spirit of chivalry and charity, sought by a careful investigation of the truth to relieve his character from those foul hues with which calumny had blackened it. Thus, on the Continent, Catholics have awakened to this noblest of duties, and have begun to discharge it. It is, we regret to say, far otherwise in England. Hitherto, scarce any Catholic of eminent ability has treated of the characters of the calumniated Pontiffs in this spirit and with this object; indeed, one might almost say, (and certainly one of the works at the head of this article substantiates our remark;) if they have written at all it has been to reproduce the hacknied calumnies they ought to have exploded, and repeat the slanders they should have rather rejoiced to refute. It is sad, but true, that if the characters of any of these Popes have had any degree of justice done to

them, it has been rather by Protestant than Catholic writers, and in connection with the family of the Borgias the name of Roscoe may serve to put some Catholic writers to shame. For ourselves we are proud to follow in this noble work—humbly and at a distance—in the footsteps of some of the finest geniuses, who, in Germany or in France, have dedicated themselves to the elucidation of these most painfully interesting periods in the history of the Papacy. We will not tamely yield up the characters of some of the ablest pontiffs who ever sat on the Chair of St. Peter to obloquy and infamy, and foul traditions of calumny. And at the era of the establishment of a Catholic university we think it may be well to direct the attention of the great minds to whom its studies of history may be entrusted, to a theme, in our conception, worthy of the noblest efforts of Catholic intellect.

It surely must soon strike any but very superficial students of history, that those pontiffs who have been most assailed by calumny have been those who were engaged in the most violent struggles with secular princes: sometimes in their exercise of the spiritual supremacy of the Holy See; sometimes in defence of those territories which constituted its patrimony. It is chiefly in contests of the latter class that the so-called “bad popes” were engaged; and although some of those who are represented as *proud* were those who had to contend for their supremacy—those who are stigmatized as *depraved* were involved in struggles for their sovereignty. And it is the root and essence of the whole system to consider that the Popes were from the earliest periods—from the age of Constantine and Valentinian, princes as well as pontiffs, with rights of temporal property and secular sovereignty.

It is necessary to cast our eyes on the origin of that state of society in Italy which existed during the days of the Pontiffs to whom we principally refer. Its origin is to be traced to the fall of the Roman Empire. We will cite no partial authority. Guizot tells us that “everything was cast into barbarism,” and that the Church “was forced to defend herself on all sides, for she was continually threatened.” He adds, in words to which we call attention—“Each bishop and priest saw his barbarous neighbours incessantly interfering with the affairs of the Church, to usurp her riches, lands, and power.” “On the death of Charlemagne,” he proceeds, “chaos commenced: all unity dis-

appeared, and the desire for independence and the habits of feudal life severed the ties of the ecclesiastical authority.” Elsewhere he describes the feudal spirit—“the nobility regarded themselves as not only independent of the Church, but as superior to it—as *alone called upon to progress, and really govern the country.*” He goes on to say, “at the commencement of the fourteenth century the Church was upon the defensive.” He notices that the “boroughs in Italy were more precocious and powerful than anywhere else. With the inconsistency which can always be detected in your “enlightened” writers, i. e. writers so “enlightened” as to hate the Church, he tells his readers in one page that the “theocratic system of the Church failed, and gave place to that attempt at democratical organization of which the Italian republics were the type, and which from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries played so brilliant a part in Europe,” taking care to add that “the emancipation of the European lay society really dates” from that era, and in almost the very next page, describing these republics he says,—“in the political system of the greater part of the republics liberty continually diminished.” “The want of security,” he says, was such, “that the factions were inevitably forced to seek refuge in a system less tempestuous, though less popular, than that with which the state had commenced.” “Take the history of Florence, Venice, Genoa, Milan, Pisa; you will everywhere see that the general course of events, instead of developing liberty, and enlarging the circle of institutions, tended to contract it, and to concentrate the power within the hands of a small body of men. In a word, in these republics, so energetic, brilliant, and wealthy, two things were wanting, *security of life*, (the first condition of a social state) and the progress of institutions.” So that the only result of the destruction of the power of the Church was—to destroy security for liberty, and prevent the progress of free institutions; and yet we are gravely told that “from that event dates the real emancipation of Europe.” And to crown the inconsistency, the learned writer elsewhere laboriously proves that the system of the Christian Church was the source of real popular liberty! Such are your “enlightened” writers! On such a state of society as he describes the Popes of the twelfth, thirteenth, and

fourteenth centuries” were cast, and also *among writers such as he*. He remarks, as the reason for the superiority of the Italian towns, (that is, in point of power) that the “fief holders,” in other words the nobles, settled in the cities. “Barbarian nobles became burghers.” We may add, what indeed follows from what he states, that the noble burghers were barbarians. There were never more barbarous ruffians to be a curse to any country than these Italian bandits, as we shall see in the sequel.

It is at the basis of the whole question whether the Popes or their opponents were strictly in the right as respects those struggles for territorial possessions, which form the chief scandal of the age of Sixtus and Julius—the age more immediately preceding the Reformation. This is not as the question of mere temporal power, one of difficulty, it is a simple question of property, a dry matter-of-fact. The point is, who were the lawful owners of the territories in Italy, which, before or during the schism of the Papacy, had been lost to the Church, and which, after the return of the Popes, were reclaimed by a succession of energetic pontiffs, as belonging to the patrimony of St. Peter? Of course, to a Puritan, who professes to hold that there ought to be no Papacy, and no ecclesiastical endowment at all, this can be no question; or it will be a knot he will soon cut with the sword of confiscation; exactly as it was cut in those very days by rapacious princes, who preferred possessing themselves of the lands of the Papacy rather than permit her purity to be imperilled by the possession. But to a Catholic, or even a Protestant, who defends a Church Establishment, and admits that a Prelate or Pontiff may, as such, have property, the primary question must be, whose were these territories of Italy? Now, we reply, they were the *Pope's*. So early as the time of Pepin, we find that the Pope was endowed with territories comprising, not only Romagna, but Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Sinagaglia, Forli, and many other places. “The origin, moreover,” says Dollinger, “of the states of the Church sprang from the *necessities of the times.*” The gift of Pepin, therefore, was without doubt in conformity with the wish of those who were included in it, and the real sovereignty of the Popes was already so widely extended through the territories above named that the gift is named by many contem-

porary historians as "an act of restitution."* The seven cities of the "Pentapolis" pertained to the Papacy, including Bologna, Imola, and Ancona. And Charlemagne confirmed the gift of his father, and added several provinces in the north and centre of Italy, comprising the dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, and some portion of Tuscany. There is strong reason to believe that the whole of Tuscany was originally part of St. Peter's patrimony: it is mentioned as such by historians; down to the thirteenth centuries we read of vicars of Tuscany. And in 1278, Pope Nicholas III., who received solemn confirmation from the Emperor of the territories above-mentioned, exercised sovereign jurisdiction over Tuscany, the vicariate of which was resigned to him.† And the real truth of the matter as regards the contests in which the Popes, during the two succeeding centuries were involved, for the defence or recovery of their territories is this,—that the "vicars" who had been appointed to rule those territories on behalf of the Papacy, rebelled against the Holy See—usurped a power which they cruelly abused; and by the dreadful atrocities they perpetrated upon the poor people who were the subjects of the Holy See, made it as much a sacred duty as a right upon its part to seek to put down such usurpations, and recover their lost dominion.

Very early in the history of the Papacy we perceive the existence and the influence, and we will add, the motive malice of calumny. Take the instance of John XII. He, with the concurrence of the bishops and barons of Italy, seeks the aid of Otho, who swore that he would preserve uninjured the possessions and rights of the Roman See, and that he would protect the Pontiff and not intrude upon his sovereignty of Rome. Upon the faith of this oath he received from the Pontiff the imperial crown, which commenced the connection between the German and Italian States. This was the most solemn recognition of the title of the Pontiff, and it was accompanied by as solemn a confirmation of his right to Tuscany, Sicily, Romagna, Spoleto, Benevento, and the rest of the patrimony of St. Peter. Soon after obtaining imperial power, however,

* Translation by Dr. Coxe, v. 3. p. 114.

† Universal Hist. B. xix. citing Sigonius.

Otho proved faithless to his oath, and instead of protecting the possessions of the Papacy, acted in an opposite spirit, and with a view to self-aggrandizement. The Protestant writers of the "Universal History" tell us that "Otho claimed the sovereign power in Rome," in direct violation of his oath, and with utter neglect of the Pope, whereupon the Pontiff made an alliance with the view of expelling him from Italy. Then it is we find (we quote these writers) "Otho sent some of his faithful attendants to Rome, to enquire into the behaviour of John." One is forcibly reminded here of the commission issued by our Henry VIII. to one of his faithful attendants, "to enquire into the behaviour of the monks and nuns." The enquiries of such "faithful attendants" of princes are never fruitless. Otho's emissaries brought him back word that the Pope led a scandalous life; they were positively scandalized—"he really was a bad pope." Of course he was—because he would not let the Emperor Otho do as he pleased with what did not belong to him. And now, all of a sudden (just like our Henry VIII. again in the matter of his marriage with Katherine) the emperor conceived scruples as to the validity of the election of the Pontiff, precisely as, a century or so after, his successor, Henry IV. chose to conceive, or pretended he conceived, scruples as to the election of Gregory VII. And in the one case, as in the other, the poor pope was accused of simony. And under imperial influence a schismatical council presumed to assemble to depose him; the council being held, under the personal auspices of the Emperor, under terror of his troops, for he marched his army to Rome—drove the Pontiff away—and then impudently interpreted his absence as an evidence of conscious guilt upon a catalogue of monstrous charges coined against him, concluding with one about drinking the devil's health! Of the atrocity of these charges there is sufficient proof, in the simple fact that the moment Otho and his army withdrew, the Romans brought back their Pope, and reinstalled him. And this is the first strong instance of the class of calumniated Pontiffs called "bad popes." What is here narrated of John XII. will be admitted to apply to Gregory VII., and in our opinion it applies equally to Alexander VI.

Now, we grieve to say that Dollinger states the story of John XII., really as if all the calumnies against him were

true, though the simple historical truth is, that no one ever heard a word of these charges until the emperor had quarrelled with him, and sent his emissaries for the express purpose of “getting up a case” against him. And there is not a particle of honest, unprejudiced evidence against the Pontiff. This is the more to be lamented and deprecated, because Dollinger, speaking of the stories of the time of John X., says very truly that they may be justly suspected, as the only writer whose testimony can be given, is the credulous Luitprand, and then stigmatizes the document he cites as a satirical libel. Yet the charges against John XII. are “clenched,” (so to speak,) by a story told by the continuator of Luitprand, on whom certainly the “mantle” of his lying spirit may be said to have fallen. Nevertheless, having just vindicated one pontiff upon the ground that the testimony against him was not credible, he proceeds to sacrifice another, (probably afraid of not being considered sufficiently candid,) against whom not only is there less credence, but none at all; nay, as to whom there is overwhelming evidence that the accusations were malignant calumnies.

Here is the true origin of the lying legends of our bad popes. They originated in an age of bad Catholics, and they are perpetuated by *candid* Catholics—Catholics too candid to be careful for truth—to say nothing of charity.

In the eleventh century, so clear was it that Sicily was a fief of the Holy See, that Nicholas II. granted it with the title of a dukedom to Robert Giscard; and in the next century we find Innocent II. raising the dukedom into a kingdom, reserving the fealty due to the Holy See;* as he had granted to the emperor in like manner the duchies of Parma, Mantua, and Modena. Roger, the new king, soon sought to cast off the yoke of fealty—influenced probably by the spirit which dictated the preaching of Arnold of Brescia—who taught that no ecclesiastic could hold endowments; a doctrine very favourable to sacrilege, and likely to be much encouraged by spoliators. It had, in fact, been long acted upon by lay princes—but was now for the first time proclaimed—by way of reducing sacrilege into a system, and making a theory for robbery. Ere long the Holy See was deprived of a great portion of its patrimony.

* Dollinger's *History of the Church*, translated by Dr. Coxe, vol. iii. p. 150. vol. iv. p. 3.

The emperors who had contests with popes about spiritual supremacy—merely for the sake of acquiring a hold on ecclesiastical property—now found a shorter, if less plausible species of spoliation. No longer content with retaining in their hands the lands of bishoprics—under pretexts of patronage—openly plundered the Holy See of its possessions. They were soon imitated by the kings of France and Spain, and a host of petty princes who originally had been tributaries of the Popes,—began by being rebels, and ended by becoming robbers.

It was against the satellites of the infamous Frederick II., who laid waste Spoleto and Ancona with Saracen troops, and tortured the inhabitants to death, that we first find a decisive instance of a pope appealing to arms. As Dollinger truly and drily observes, “the Pope’s excommunication would here have been pronounced in vain—he therefore resolved to meet force with force, and by force of arms obliged the brutal and infidel invaders to fly.” “This invasion by a papal army,” adds the historian, “to which Gregory IX. found himself necessitated by his duty, to defend his own territories from the attacks of his enemies, was afterwards represented by Frederick as an unprovoked attempt to deprive him of his kingdom.” And writers in the interest of the emperor doubtless would represent him on that account as a bad pope. But the question is, whether the Pontiff would have been performing his duty in permitting his own subjects to be “cruelly tortured to death” by infidel invaders, albeit in the pay and employ of Christians, worse than infidels. Let the question be calmly determined by the rules and principles of moral theology in the case of Gregory IX., before a “candid Catholic” comes to consider and condemn the cases of subsequent pontiffs, which we contend were perfectly parallel in this respect, although they have chiefly on this account been covered with obloquy.

Frederick of Germany and Charles of Anjou both alike formed designs of seizing the whole of the Papal territory, and effecting the subjugation of Italy: and the result of the intrigues thus raised was, that at the close of the thirteenth century the Papacy continued vacant for upwards of two years by reason of the contentions between the houses of the Colonna and the Orsini, who had been engaged by the rival factions, and the unhappy Pontiff who shortly after succeeded Boniface VIII. died a victim to the bru-

talities of a Philip le Bel with the aid of a Colonna.* Boniface figures as a “bad pope.” But who drew his portrait? Partisans of Philip and friends of his foes—the Colonna. Candid Catholics, it is true, have engraved the false portrait and circulated it: it is to be seen in the pages of Dollinger. But truth is stronger than iron or brass, and ever proves in the end too powerful even for false candour to disguise it.

Half a century afterwards Innocent VI., the “zealous and the virtuous,” as the candid Dollinger calls him, found the states of the Church divided into small provinces under tyrants, and upon the point of being lost to the Papacy. The Pontiff therefore sent a small army of mercenaries who in a short time restored the power of the Pope throughout the greater part of his dominions, with the connivance and assistance of the celebrated Rienzi, the idol of the Roman people; a sufficient proof that the measure, upon the part of the Pope, was one of which they firmly approved. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, as we find the “misery of Rome (and the Roman States) carried to the highest degree by the wild lawlessness and the endless feuds of the families of the rude nobles, the Colonnas, the Orsini, and the Savelli, whose bands of retainers plundered and murdered even the pilgrims”—who will pretend that it was not the duty of the Pope to repress these disorders by force of arms? Certainly, the people thought so, and her sway was restored by the great exertions of the popular tribune and the papal vicar. Yet who doubts that the partizans of the Orsini or the Colonnas represented Innocent as a “bad pope?” and if printing had been invented, it would probably have branded him for centuries as such.

Well, Urban V. found himself compelled to ask Charles IV. to subdue the atrocious Bernabo Visconti, the tyrant of Milan, who oppressed Bologna, and was subjecting to himself the territories of the Pope. Yet Urban was devout and meek: a humble and holy monk.

In the times of his successor, Gregory XI., there was a general revolt of the States of the Church, fomented by

* *Colonnensium domus auxia domesticis, molesta vicinis. Romanorum Reip. impugnatrice, Sanctæ ecclesiæ Romanæ rebellis urbis et patriæ perturbatrix consortis impatiens, ingrata beneficiis, subesse nolens, præesse nesciens, humilitatis ignara, plena furoribus, Deum non metuens nec volens homines revereri, habens de urbis et orbis turbatione pruritum.* Bull of Boniface, VIII. 10 May, 1297.

the Florentines, towards the latter part of the fourteenth century.

We may say, in the language of Schlegel, that the real point of transition, in Italian history, from good to evil, from those Christian principles which were ever predominant in the earlier period, to the unappeasable contests of the Guelphs and Ghibellines in the later middle age, must be fixed in the reign of the Emperor Frederick the First. With unrelenting severity, (says the illustrious writer,) and with atrocious cruelty, this Ghibelline emperor destroyed the confederate cities of Lombardy, and crushed the fair plant of Italian civilization, just then beginning to bloom. Ignorant and prejudiced writers often talk of the Papacy as having, by its influence, "blighted" Italy; indeed, this is one of the cries of the age. Let them mark such striking testimonies as those of Schlegel and Guizot. Our subject has a close connection with that interesting question: who can be considered responsible for the obstruction or destruction of civilization during the dark turbulent times to which we refer? Not Popes, but Emperors; not the spiritual power, but the temporal, "crushed the fair plant of Italian civilization." Guizot shows how the Church was the parent of civilization. Schlegel shows how it was crushed by the enemies of the Church. And our subject will illustrate the fact. "Although," says Schlegel, "the last Ghibelline Emperor, Frederick the Second, had been educated by Pope Innocent III., a Pontiff distinguished by his enlarged views and great intellectual endowments, yet the old dispute broke out again, under this monarch, with more violence and implacable animosity than ever. The quarrel was nevermore appeased, at least during the sway of Frederick II. and his family; and it terminated only with the downfall of the Hohenstaufen. Yet the Ghibelline name, heretofore stamped in characters of blood upon the earth, subsisted for a long while; and for ages after the Ghibelline spirit continued to be the prevailing one in Europe. The later princes of the Swabian family all resembled each other in unbending sternness of character. Henry VI. perpetrated the most enormous cruelties at Naples. The blood shed by Ezzelin, while governor of Lombardy under Frederick the Second, left behind him so fearful a recollection, that the last of the family, Conradin, was an innocent victim of the public hatred borne to his ances-

tors, and perished on a scaffold at Naples by the hand of Charles of Anjou, who had seized on the Sicilies.”

There is a remarkable observation of the modern historian of Florence, which embodies a great fact illustrated by the whole history of the Papacy in the Middle Ages. When the Florentines were in dreadful apprehension of an attack from the excellent Galeazzo Visconti, (the object of Poggio’s eulogy,) we are informed by the Protestant historian that they looked in vain to every quarter for assistance: “the Pope alone remained—and as it was thought *his own interest would lead him to right conclusions*—every endeavour was exerted to secure his aid.” These involuntary admissions on the part of Protestant writers—unhandsome—uncandid—uncharitable as they are, are invaluable. It is evident that in the passage we have just cited, Mr. Napier was desirous of stating a fact extorted from him, in the way least favourable to the Papacy. The plain fact was, that in this, as in every other instance, in those times of violence, oppressed humanity turned towards the Papacy instinctively for aid. The Protestant historian cannot disguise the fact—he seeks to insinuate his own reason for it, and refers to it as simply the result of a sagacious regard to self-interest on the part of the Popedom. Well moralists teach us that all virtue consists in a due regard to self-interest; but taking it even at the lowest—such a well-regulated regard for it as led to a regard for the interests of others was rare in those days, and has been rare ever since; and we venture to say has never been constantly and consistently exemplified in any other institution but the Papacy. Setting aside, however, all supernatural sanction or mission, we believe that the Papal supremacy could be triumphantly sustained upon the very principle thus put forward by the able Protestant writer—that on the whole and in the long-run it would always be perceived that “the interest of the Papacy would lead it to right conclusions.” The reason is obvious. Its only chance of support upon human principles is the confidence entertained in its integrity, incorruptibility, and impartiality—and the loss of its character, for those attributes would, humanly speaking, be its destruction. It has never lost that character, and to this day the conviction is general which prevailed amongst the Florentines five hundred years ago, that the interest of the Papacy would lead it to right conclusions.

The Florentines fancied that their interests would be promoted by taking part at this crisis with the foes of the Church, and all the ecclesiastical cities were incited by her to revolt. This is the statement of Napier.* “Florence,” he says. “under the motto of ‘*Libertas*,’ declared herself ready to support unconditionally,” (i. e., right or wrong,) “any ecclesiastical city that desired its freedom,” i. e., wished to rebel. In plain English, the Florentines conspired to rob the Church, and of not less than eighty towns did they thus plunder the Holy See. Pope Gregory was again compelled to enlist mercenaries. The Protestant historian is again horrified. Still he is obliged to add that “before commencing he offered to desist if the Florentines would only leave Bologna and discontinue the war.”† In other words, he only desired to defend his subjects from unscrupulous marauders, and was ready to forgive the past if they would only stop their career of plunder. It appears hardly credible, did we not read it with our own eyes it would be utterly incredible—that men like Napier should, notwithstanding all this, represent the Holy See as the aggressors, as the assailants in this struggle for its temporal possessions; and as responsible for the miseries it occasioned! Well, the Pope excommunicated them. In the ages of faith this was considered serious, and a deputation from Florence waited on him, and a scene of crimination and recrimination ensued—at least so say the Protestant historians—in whose pages—(even taking Mr. Napier’s account)—it is impossible not to see that the Pope had the best of it. How could it be otherwise? as the facts would speak for themselves. “You Florentines,” said the indignant Pontiff, “marched your armies to Perugia and Bologna, to besiege the citadels of the Church and expel her governors:—this is not defending yourselves from aggression, but doing violence to others. And what shall we say of the cities in La Marca so distant from you? Surely not fear or despair! but a hatred of the Church could move you to make them revolt! It was not only to diminish the ecclesiastical authority in Italy, but to destroy it, that you thus acted. And yet you call yourselves children of the Roman Church!” Here the Pope had them; and here the Papacy

* Vol. II. p. 330.

† Vol. II. p. 384.

has all bad Catholics—we beg pardon—candid and enlightened Catholics, who are found fighting or writing against the Holy See. In *them* it is treason:—treason to their own professed convictions—a betrayal of their pretended principles, and they are in a dilemma between hypocrisy and iniquity.

It was at this period that the Florentines (“to show their anxiety for peace,” say the Protestant historians, and the candid Catholics, but, as the result plainly proved, merely to make use of a Saint, in order to escape the terms their nefarious conduct merited,) induced the Blessed Catherine of Sienna to attempt to bring about a reconciliation with the Pope, who at once “gave her full powers to treat.” These were the words of Mr. Napier,* and he little thought how triumphantly they vindicated the character of the Pontiff. He gave a saint full powers to treat. Then how was it no peace ensued? Clearly it was not his fault. It was because she dealt with sinners, with bad and wretched men, who wished not for peace, but a sword. The people, indeed, desired peace, and this the Pontiff knew, and for their sakes was anxious for it. But their crafty leaders prevented it. Mr. Napier tells us that “all that Gregory required was the deposition of these men, and then Florence might have peace on her own terms.” Again we say, little did the Protestant historian imagine how these words vindicated the Pontiff he was so eagerly assailing. All that the Pope wished was to rid Florence of the bad men who, for their own base purposes, kept her plunged in an unprincipled war. They, of course, strove, by all the arts of unscrupulous misrepresentation, to maintain their influence; and in the face of flagrant facts, and in manifest inconsistency with their own confessions and admissions, your “enlightened” Protestants, and “candid” Catholics, adopt all their mendacious representations, and their sinister calumnies. And yet the very next chapter of the historian commences by a confession that Florence could not secure herself for a moment from the heartless tyranny and struggles of domestic faction.† Unfaithful to the Church, rebellious to the Holy See, the prey of unprincipled and depraved

* Vol. ii. p. 403.

† Napier, vol. ii. c. xxvii. p. 407.

men, how could she? Mr. Napier describes with power the dreadful reign of terror which prevailed in this unhappy city until, in 1379, Salvestri de Medici rescued her from her sad fate, and gave her something like peace, founding, at the same time, the fame, the fortunes, and the glory, of his illustrious family.

As it was in Florence, so it was in France:—“In France,” says Schlegel, “which now took up that attitude of hostility towards the head of the Church which the Emperors had once assumed, an entirely new era in European policy, which had now ceased to be “Christian,” (pregnant words! expressing a fact followed by fatal results, and for which not the spiritual, but the temporal power, was responsible,) commenced with the reign of Philip le Bel, (a worthy predecessor of Louis XI.) who fixed the Papacy at Avignon.” “It was a deep-laid plan of policy on his part, in order the more easily to extort their consent to all his selfish projects; a policy by which the Popes were kept, during seventy years, in a state of absolute dependance on the court of France.” During those seventy years, as we shall see, the Holy City was thrown into a state of disorganization and misrule, which it required stern measures, a century or two afterwards, to remedy; and this is the key to the history of what are called the “bad popes” of that age. “And when at last one of the Popes succeeded in rescuing the chair of St. Peter from this Babylonish captivity, and placing it again at Rome, Popes were abetted one against the other at Rome and Avignon; and a schism broke out in the Church, which lasted for forty years, till it was finally quelled by the General Council of Constance.” This was, of course, followed by consequences still more fatal; it shook the faith of Europe in the Divine Mission of the Papacy as the source of Catholic unity, and probably tended, more than any thing else, to produce that spirit of disrespect for the Holy See, which, developed in the Reformation, had been working for a century before in Christendom; and the bad character of the spurious popes, along with the calumnies which the patrons of these miserable puppets disseminated against the true successors of St. Peter, brought odium and disgrace on the sacred chair, which ought to have been ever viewed with pious veneration.

“The great wealth of the Church,” says Schlegel, “was

not the sole, but one of the principal subjects of dispute with the secular power, and was even “a stumbling-block to many.” How could it be so, except from the rife spirit of cupidity and envy? It is hard to imagine otherwise, since that illustrious writer, supported by such enlightened Protestants as Guizot and Hallam, testifies that this “wealth had furnished the means of cultivating and fertilizing the soil of Europe, and sowing the seeds of science in the human intellect,” (albeit under a religion which we have of late years learned, tends to “stifle the intellect and degrade the soul,”) and he adds, “that this wealth the clergy generally employed in a manner the most praiseworthy and the most conducive to the welfare of the community :” as who can doubt, who recollects the mediæval maxim that it was better to live under the crozier than the lance, and who calls to mind the innumerable colleges, hospitals, cathedrals, and schools founded or augmented by episcopal or clerical donors? “The annals of modern Europe, and the history of every great and petty state within it, are full of the high political services which the excellent Churchmen of the Middle Age rendered to the public weal. It is easy to conceive that all the members of the higher body had not rendered services equally eminent, and that the employment of their riches had not been equally laudable.” “It may be easy to conceive this,” but we are not aware of any well-attested instances in which the employment of wealth by Churchmen was not better than its use by the laity of the times. Schlegel says, however, “independently of individual abuses and scandals, the great wealth of the dignified clergy, the eminent and splendid rank they occupied in the state and in society are ever a stumbling-block to the people :” (no, not to the people, for they found friends and benefactors, in the bishops and their protectors against the barons, and it was not the people but the rebels who regarded them with envy and jealousy, “and even to some ecclesiastics,” (who envied wealth and rank they did not possess themselves,) in contradiction with the original rule and evangelical poverty of the primitive Christians—a hypocritical cloak, the cloak for cupidity, which lusted for the riches of the Church—riches which the history testifies were only held in trust for the poor, and were nobly expended in works of charity, hospitality, and piety.

The general statement given by Guizot is true through-

out the whole of the period referred to: true as well of the times of Boniface VIII. as of Alexander VI.; true alike of Philip-le-Bel and Charles VIII. of France; true of the turbulent and truculent barons of Italy, on whom their intrigues were practised, and who in turn practised their intrigues or depredations upon the Holy See. During the whole of this period the Popes were in the condition of the man in the parable—thrown among thieves. Literally they were surrounded by robbers; whose unscrupulous aggressions they had continually to resist; and if they resisted at all successfully were slandered by those servile writers whom they had in their pay. The great houses of Rome, the Colonna and the Orsini for example, were perpetually making the papacy the subject of their intrigues—“malice, domestic and foreign levy.” In the brutal outrages of Philip the Fair against Boniface, he had the Colonnas for his allies, and later still, in the same half century, we find a Colonna aiding an excommunicated emperor to be crowned at Rome. These rapacious nobles possessed themselves of the patrimony of the Church, and when dispossessed by an able Pontiff they are represented by unprincipled writers as oppressed victims of Pontifical rapacity! Let us just give an instance. In 1340 some of these ruffianly gentry submitted to the Holy See, (under compulsion) and restored the places they had plundered; whereupon they were, on their own entreaty, appointed vicars to govern these places, on their paying certain sums in compensation for their spoliations, on which Villani hypocritically exclaims, “Oh, avaricious Church! how art thou degenerated from the humble purity and holy poverty of Christ.” The hypocritical cry of all who have spoiled the Church in every country and every age.

The historians of Italy, being always in the interest of the princes and nobles, took care to represent the Pontiffs as the aggressors and oppressors, their own patrons as the innocent and the assailed; but the most candid student of Italian history can scarcely fail to see that this is a grossly mendacious representation. In the thirteenth century Pope Gregory IX., in a letter addressed to the Papal Legate, in the camp of the army which was defending the Holy See in the deadly struggle it then had to sustain against the Swabian dynasty, writes thus upon the question: “It is the will of God, that to protect the

liberty of the Church, humility does not prevent the defence of it by arms, provided that defence does not go beyond the limits which humanity prescribes.” “ For these reasons we command you to preserve from all injury those who fall into the hands of our troops, and to treat them, so that they may rejoice to have exchanged a state of culpable licentiousness for that of Christian captivity. You shall instruct our commanders henceforth to abstain from all kinds of violence, under the penalty of incurring our indignation.” Such were the sentiments which the Holy See sought to inculcate among its defenders ; such the spirit which it strove to infuse into them. What a contrast to the sanguinary atrocities of its assailants, among whom, amidst deeds of cruelty that make the flesh creep, we may search in vain for similar exhortations !

In 1370, we have it on Protestant testimony, that Pope Gregory XI. was undisputed lord of the “ Patrimony ” of St. Peter, of great part of the Romagna and of the dukedom of Spoleto, with Perugia and Bologna. A year or two after, we find Ambrogio Visconti, one of the knightly ruffians of the age, ravaging part of this territory, and the Pope compelled to impose a tithe on the Church in order to defend the possessions of the Holy See. And the very historians who narrate the story of this brutal aggression, speak of “ rapacity,” not of the assailant, but of the assailed. Ineffably odious is the hypocrisy with which Protestant historians (and Catholics who in their candour calumniate the Church quite as much) exclaim against the poor pontiffs for enlisting in their service, for the protection of their territories, some of those mercenary soldiers who were then the curse of Italy, and if they were not retained as defenders, were certain to be ruthless foes. Even Mr. Napier says, “ The great lords of Italy had profited by the Pope’s residence at Avignon to *usurp almost all the ecclesiastical dominions* in Romagna, La Maria, Spoleto, and the “ Patrimony,” everything had been occupied ; the Malatesti (those monsters of cruelty,) “ with a *swarm of lesser tenants, had usurped the sovereignty of numerous cities*, which it was necessary that the Church should recover, or abandon them with all her temporal power in Italy ;” a loss, which of course a Protestant would not regret, but which a really enlightened Catholic knows would be as great an injury to the Church at large, as the plunder of the revenues of a diocese would be to its spiri-

tual subjects, or the sequestration of the tithes of a parish would be to its inhabitants; that is to say, it would be the sacrilegious appropriation, to purposes of rapacious plunder, of revenues dedicated to objects of piety and charity; and it would be wrong to overlook that in the case of the Papal dominions in the Middle Ages, it would involve the surrender of the subjects of the Church to the shocking tyranny of *fiends in human shape*, for such these tyrants were, whose rapacity is recorded even by Protestant historians, who, nevertheless, in the blindness of prejudice, speak with the same breath and write in the same sentence, of the ambition or the aggressiveness of the *Church*—the Church, which at the worst, did but defend her own.

If we do not desire to be the dupe of “lying witnesses,” we must cross-examine the historians who testify against Pontiffs, and sift their character.* Take Poggio for

* Mr. Napier truly says, “Machiavelli’s inaccuracy is notorious.” Ammirato thus speaks of him: “His want of care is seen throughout his history. He changes years, *alters facts*, substitutes names, confounds causes, augments, diminishes, adds, subtracts, and lets his fancy run without a bridle, or any legitimate control; and, in many places, he *seems to act more from design than error or ignorance*; perhaps because by this he was enabled to write more elegantly, and less drily, than he would have done if obedient to dates and facts.”—(Lib. 23, p. 96.) Bruto also says: “I follow Machiavelli when I can get no better authority; but where he wants sincerity, (which frequently happens,) or accuracy, I will not shield him.”—(Lib. 2. p. 125.) And, be it observed, Bruto was a warm admirer of Machiavelli, and immediately declares himself to be so. Let it be borne in mind that the assailants of the bad Popes, especially of Alexander VI., make a liberal use of the name of Machiavelli when they can find a passage to suit their purpose, (although, after all, he records little, if anything, clearly attaching any stigma to their character,) while they pass over, or set at nought, any passages of a contrary tendency; and they utterly disregard the inconsistencies, or the influences, which affect his credibility. They eagerly quote his narrative of the conspiracy of the Pazzi, in order to support (which it really does not) their accusations against Sixtus IV., regardless that his history was written for one of the Medici, of whom he said, “I wish that the Signore Medici would employ me, if only in rolling a stone.” And, on the other hand, they as eagerly quote the letters written, during his sojourn with Cæsar Borgia, in reference to the tragedy of Sinigag-

instance. He writes most dreadful things of Popes and Prelates, and particularly of Gregory XI., casting on him all the odium of the horrors which marked the war waged by the Florentines against the Church. Now how shall we test his evidence? Happily the means are not wanting of ascertaining the worth of *his* testimony to character, and of appreciating his *own*. There was a ruffian in those days, named Galeazzo Visconti, who transcended even the ordinary atrocities of that ferocious age. He signalized his career by the murder of his uncle and cousin, and then of *his own sister*, a lady of extreme beauty and innocence, whose only crime was beseeching him for their lives! His treachery and cruelty had in them something truly demoniacal. He, by forged letters, induced the husband of his cousin to murder her for supposed infidelity. This is but one instance of his crimes. Well, of this demon in human form, Poggio—the impartial Poggio, whom enlightened Protestants and candid Catholics quote with calm complacency, when he testifies against a Pontiff for defending his own territory from brutal aggressors, the impartial Poggio (aye, and Muratori likewise) can speak of the monster Galeazzo as great and sagacious, and *magnanimous* and *clement*! Verily it is almost sufficient vindication of the Papacy that it should be vilified by such men! Woe unto it when they speak well of it! So much for their testimony in matters moral. Let us take an instance of it in matters statistical: simple, plain, matters of fact and figures.

Of John XXII., who died in 1335, Villani, whose brother was one of the Papal Commissioners, states that he amassed 25,000,000 golden florins. We particularly note the circumstance that a Papal Commissioner, who might naturally be supposed to have official means of knowledge, thus states, as a fact, what there can be no reason to question is an extravagant falsehood. Albert of Strasburg, a *contemporary* writer, states the amount at 1,700,000 florins, a difference of *only* about 24,000,000! And Voltaire, a tolerably *impartial* authority on such a

lia, representing his testimony as unimpeachable, because he was the friend of Borgia; they well knowing that he was at Cæsar's court and camp as spy, rather than as friend; and as the envoy of his mortal foes, the Florentines.

- subject, and sufficiently acute, questions the *possibility* of the larger sum *ever* having been amassed, especially in the course of a short period, and in turbulent times. Napier, the able Protestant historian of Florence, also disbelieves the extravagant statement of the Papal Commissioner, and sensibly observes that it is the less likely to be at all true, seeing that the far *smaller* sum stated by the other writer would, allowing for the difference in the value of money, nearly equal the larger sum in money of our own day. Now let the reader remark this instance; it is only an *instance* of the manner in which *contemporary* writers, even those who had occupied *official* stations in the Papal Court, permitted themselves to be led by the spirit of party, or from a desire to pander to the spirit of party in others, to speak of the conduct of a deceased Pontiff.

“When the Popes had returned to Rome from the captivity of Avignon, experience taught them how necessary to their dignity and independence was the possession of a sovereign principality, which, however inconsiderable, should at least be free from foreign controul. Nay, since the German Empire had become really extinct, or existed only in name, it was the interest of the secular powers themselves, that the political authority of the Pope within the Ecclesiastical States should rest on a firm and secure foundation, and should thus afford a guarantee that the Sovereign Pontiff who would not again be in a state of exclusive dependence on any one of the different powers, divided as they now all were in interests and enervated by mutual jealousy.” This is one of the most important testimonies in history. It is a testimony to the necessity for the sake of the Church, and of Christendom—of the necessity of temporal possessions attached to the Holy See—the value to the world of St. Peter’s patrimony. One would think it followed from this testimony that the possessions should be protected and that patrimony preserved. Yet, such is the force of prejudice, that even the illustrious Schlegel is not proof against it, and he immediately adds what neutralizes his testimony—“Without taking into account the personal scandals of Alexander VI., the mode in which some popes, especially of the Borgia family, sought to consolidate their power within the ecclesiastical territory, must have appeared very revolting in the spiritual heads of Christendom. And although Julius II.

possessed many great and princely qualities, still an injurious impression must have been produced on the public and popular mind when the chief ecclesiastic, a prince of peace, girded on the sword !” Very likely, on “ the popular and public mind ” of those who sought to profit by the weakness of the Papacy, and plunder it of its patrimony.

But the struggle that ensued in Italy during the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, and in which the Papacy were involved on the return of the Popes from Italy, the great thing is to observe who were the aggressors. This is a point almost always and dishonestly shirked by writers on the Papacy—whether “ enlightened ” Protestants or “ candid ” Catholics. Thus, Ranke, who is particularly lauded for his impartiality, when he comes, at the commencement of his “ *History of the Popes,* ” to describe the contest in which Sixtus IV., Alexander VI., and Julius II., engaged, represents it as an aggression on their part for aggrandizement of their dominions, although he well knew, and evinces that he knew, that it was simply a struggle for the recovery of the patrimony of the Church from the hands of spoliators. He himself says that the regions they sought to recover were “ regarded as the patrimony of the Church ; ” and speaking of the part of Romagna which Sixtus strove to restore to the Papal States, says “ that if the question were one of right, undoubtedly the Pope had the best title to it. ” But this admission, enormous as it is, is but half the truth. The case of the Popes in this matter rests not merely on property, but duty. It was not a case of mere territory to be recovered, but of subjects to be rescued. The tyrannical spoliators who had possessed themselves of the Papal territories were ruthless as lawless. They perpetrated abominable atrocities on the miserable people in their power, who groaned for deliverance from their brutal yoke ;—and groaned for restoration to the gentle sway of the Church, whose yoke indeed was easy, and whose burden was light. Strange that candid Catholics and enlightened Protestants, albeit they are great lovers of liberty, and prate largely of humanity, have not charity enough to suppose that these considerations may possibly have influenced the Popes who sought to recover territories of which the Holy See had been spoiled.

The contests between Henry IV. and Gregory VII.,

and between Frederick Barbarossa and Alexander III., left in Italy deeply sown the seeds of fierce faction and perpetual strife, and in the pages of Dante we see vividly depicted the terrible fruits of the enmity between the Guelphs and the Ghibellines, and the constant struggle between the spiritual and the temporal, symbolized in the thirteenth century by the name of Boniface VIII., and in the fifteenth by that of Innocent III. Candid Catholics have been too prone to surrender such names to condemnation, as the names of “bad Popes;” and we have purposely mentioned the last, because the magnificent vindication of Hurter has, in our own days, supplied a striking proof of the extent to which this false candour has been carried, in cowardly deference to ignorance and prejudice. Machiavelli, writing of the close of the fifteenth century, gives us the key to a truthful view of this era in the history of the Papacy, the age of Innocent VIII., Sixtus IV., and Alexander VI. “To keep down,” he says, “the Papal influence, the power of the Pontiff was secretly neutralized by engendering jealousies and hostilities, and causes of dissension in Rome between the principal houses of the nobility. Dissensions were sedulously promoted. The magnates of Rome were divided into two factions, the Orsini and the Colonnas; and pains were taken to have them with arms in their hands, so as to keep the Court of Rome weakened and disabled.”*

As Napier says, “the various families of the aristocracy formed populous clans, all bearing the same name, and generally united for good or evil.” Thus we read of one lord, who having five married sons, was, on the occasion of a private feud, enabled to assemble thirty cousins and nephews under arms. When feuds of this kind arose between such families, we can conceive the bitterness with which they were perpetuated from age to age, as, for instance, the feud between the Bianchi and Neri, in Florence, in 1300, which spread its poison through many succeeding generations, and altered the whole aspect of the city. Shakspeare, in his *Romeo and Juliet*, has left a striking picture of the deadly animosities resulting from such a system, in the hatred of the *Capulets* and *Monta-*

* Hist. Flor. cap. ii.

gues. A single specimen from real history will suffice to show the sanguinary spirit engendered by these strifes. One of the Pazzi, in 1312, was slain by one of the Cavalcanti, on account of the murder of one of the latter family by one of the former some years before. The Cavalcanti were instantly attacked by the Pazzi and their friends, and nearly fifty of them seized. The Pazzi, at the commencement of the fourteenth century, had slain Corso Donati, whom Machiavelli describes as “one of the rarest citizens Florence ever produced,”* and who was a friend of the Medici,—then, for the first time, rising into notice. The body of the illustrious chieftain was now taken from his tomb, and borne round the city by the adherents of his party, in order to inflame their enmity and inspire their thirst of revenge. But Corso himself, what manner of man had he been while alive—this *worthy* chief—this object of the eulogy of Machiavelli? We have more reasons than one for noticing the manner of man whom Machiavelli “delighted to honour.” He had returned to Florence, after exile, under the protection of the infamous Charles of Anjou, to wreak his vengeance on his opponents. He was of the faction of the Neri; they of the Bianchi. “The Neri rode triumphant, says the historian, over the city; vagabonds of every description were let loose; the hand of murder was red; the torch flew rapidly; the Bianchi were despoiled; their daughters married by force; their sons slaughtered. Throughout this infernal drama the armed form of Donati was seen, like a fiend, at every turn seeking for the Cherchi, his opponents; and when food for murder, flames, and plunder, were exhausted in Florence, the still insensate maniac sallied into the country, and ravaged a whole district, without cessation or remorse, for eight whole days. Perjury, robbery, rape, torture, murder—such the results of the hatred, revenge, and anarchy engendered by these fearful feuds.” The incidents seem hardly credible. “On Christmas Day the favourite son of Corso was *listening to a sermon*, when one of the Cherchi passed; the other flew after him, and slew him, without any quarrel, excited only by fiery blood and party-spirit—without preconceived plan, or provocation—in the midst of

* Machiavelli, Lib. ii.

a discourse from the pulpit on Christ's Nativity, and its blessings of peace and good-will towards men, suddenly determined to *murder his own uncle!** He succeeded, but *received a mortal stab from his expiring victim.*" What a picture of horror! And among such demons in human form the Popes had to govern the Church.

Just as it was in Florence, so it was at Rome. There, as the historian of Florence tells us, the long protracted absence of pontifical government had made Rome a scene of anarchy; the two senators, Orsini and Colonna, each with his own faction, were *hereditary and deadly enemies*. The streets were, in consequence, *infested with assassins*, the *roads with robbers*, and nothing but war and slaughter was seen in the Eternal City. This was in the middle of the fourteenth century. And while Rome was infested with robbers and murderers, the States of the Church were perpetually subjected to the atrocities of robbers and murderers on a larger scale. One of the chapters of Machiavelli is headed thus: "The Duke of Milan deceives the Pope, and takes many places from the Church."† The historian says, "the Duke resolved to take Romagna from the Pontiff, imagining that his Holiness (was so beset that he) could not injure him." This was towards the middle of the fifteenth century. The Duke is helped, we read, by one Niccolo, which Niccolo, after his son had pillaged Spoleto, (one of the Papal cities,) took Bologna, Imola, and Forli (also Papal towns); and of twenty fortresses held in that country for the Pope, "*not one escaped falling into his hands.*" Machiavelli observes pithily, but parenthetically, that this is "worthy of remark," and we think so too. He adds: "Not satisfied with these injuries inflicted on the Pontiff, he (the said Niccolo) resolved to banter him with words, as well as ridicule him by deeds, and wrote that he had only done as his Holiness deserved, for having unblushingly attempted to *divide two such attached friends as the Duke and himself.*" "Banter, indeed!" "Attached friends!" "*Arcades ambo,*" *id est*, ruffians both. Such were the princes and potentates among whom the lot of the Pontiffs of that age was cast; such the men from whom Sixtus IV., at the

* Napier, vol. i. p. 386.

† Hist. Flor. B. v. ch. iv.

end of that century, resolved to rescue those territories of the Holy See, which they had sacrilegiously stolen, and were cruelly oppressing. The long and the short of it is, the brutal spirit of Philip-le-Bel and Barbarossa had infected Italy, and the spoilers, who were robbed of their prey, revenged themselves by *calumny*.

The injustice to which the Pontiffs have been subjected who resisted aggressions on the territories of the Holy See, or strove to reclaim her just rights, is remarkable when we come to the age of Sixtus IV., who is described by Paverno as a Pope of “immense cupidity;” whereas the truth is, that he was a Pontiff of extraordinary liberality, expending vast sums in the improvement of Rome; for which purpose, however, he laid on, it appears, heavy imposts, which may account for the enmity he excited in some quarters, while his efforts to restore to the Holy See its rightful possessions, excited the utmost hatred in others. Ranke tells us that Sixtus IV. was the first Pope by whom the project was first effectually undertaken of regaining these territories, which were the patrimony of the Church, and is compelled to confess that he had manifestly a better title than the princes who were possessed of them; yet, with the marvellous inconsistency which characterizes Protestant writers in speaking of the Papacy, he proceeds to reprobate his use of spiritual and temporal weapons in what he admits a rightful struggle. Those who were in possession of these territories were sacrilegious spoilers; and it is an affectation of humanity to be scandalized at the strenuous efforts of a Sixtus or a Julius to recover them for the benign sway of the Church, especially in an age when it was a saying that it “was better to be under the crosier than under the lance.”

A most remarkable instance of the systematic unfairness with which the character of the Popes is assailed on the slightest surmise, without the shadow of evidence, is afforded in the conspiracy of the Pazzi against the Medici. That illustrious family happened, at that time, as constantly happened to the turbulent republic of which they formed the head, to be at enmity with the Pontiff; and the aim of the writers under their influence was to implicate him in the conspiracy, by representing Salviati, the Archbishop, as concerned in it, with the sanction of Sixtus. For the participation of the prelate, which is the

foundation of the charge against the Pope, there is not the pretence of proof. The republic were at variance with the Pope, and the Archbishop is charged with a mission from him to them, which it is pretty plain he was trying to discharge at the fatal moment when the conspirators attacked the Medici; for all the writers who record the fearful events of that day, mention his having, in his interview with the Gonfalonier, alluded to the Pope. Amidst the confusion and excitement caused by the attempted assassination of the Medici, the Gonfalonier, in a fit of sudden suspicion, or in a secret rage, which *simulated* suspicion, seized upon the archbishop, and instantly hung him, before it was possible to have had the least evidence of his participation in any conspiracy, least of all, of one so sanguinary. A deed more dreadful was never perpetrated; and the murder of the unhappy prelate is made at once the excuse for blackening his memory, and even as evidence against him. It is easy to hang men first, and then to accuse, and those who have hung will be certain to condemn; but candid men might suspect that, had there been reason to suspect his guilt, no execution could have been so sudden; and it is our opinion that his death was a deed of blood, casting the deepest infamy on those who *permitted* it, not less than on those who *perpetrated* it.

For proof of the incredible story we are referred to the statements of the “Synod” held for the purpose of criminalizing the Pontiff, (of which it is sufficient to say that the language is so atrocious, that it even shocks the Protestant Roscoe,) and the memorial drawn up by Bartholomew Scala, the Chancellor of Florence, that is to say, the tool of the Medici, who reigned paramount there. Both these precious documents are the *ex parte* statements of avowed enemies—of persons in notorious enmity with the parties they impeach; and of the one and the other Dr. Madden very justly says, that not a single proof is given of the Pope, Cardinal, or Archbishop, having participated in the conspiracy for assassination. He adds, “the evidence of tortured witnesses, and the confessions put in the mouths of tempted wretches condemned to death, are the foundation of the charge.” It is perfectly plain to any truly candid person, that the real conspirators were the partisans of the Medici, who sought, with the vile spirit of the times, to murder the characters of those whom they had mur-

dered in person, and those who might be the avengers of their victims.*

Why have we mentioned this instance of the calumnies with which the Pontiffs were assailed? Because it is an illustration of the system under which Alexander VI. is gibbeted to execration by calumnies as groundless as atrocious. Principally upon the assumed fact of the murdered prelate's participation in the conspiracy, it is alleged by the partisans of the Medici, that the Pope had sanctioned it, that the Cardinal Riario was despatched to Florence, to direct the conspiracy, and Salvati, the Archbishop, was charged with the arrangement of all the details of the projected murder. Now, as Dr. Madden truly says, (and he is certainly not disposed to be too tender of the reputation of at least one Pontiff, or too reluctant to receive charges against him,) "*the whole of this statement rests on mere assertion*, with the exception of a conspiracy having existed for the murder of the Medici." And he adds, "that the idea of a pope sending a cardinal to the capital of another State to direct the execution of a number of murders of its rulers, (and charging an archbishop with the 'details of the arrangement,') is somewhat novel." The story is absurd; it is wholly incredible. "It was a hazardous mission for a cardinal to be sent on," says Dr. Madden shrewdly. "But what are we to think of the care of the Pope for a nephew?" (the Cardinal de Riario); and is it likely that he would expose a relation to the imminent peril of a failure, or discovery of the plot, (a peril too which the poor Archbishop found so fatal,) when any layman could have managed it with less danger of attracting attention?

Passing over Innocent's brief Papacy, Alexander VI. succeeded, and, we need scarcely say, is generally supposed to have surpassed him immeasurably in iniquity. He is, beyond all comparison, the worst or the best possible specimen of a so-called bad pope, or rather, as the writer believes, the most remarkable instance of the influence of ignorance, prejudice, and calumny. And

* It is worthy of observation that even Machiavelli, who wrote under the influence of the Medici, though he *represents* the Archbishop as implicated, states no single fact or overt act clearly proving his participation in the conspiracy, and does not say a word to imply a suspicion of any complicity of Sixtus.

for that reason we select him for our principal illustration of this evil influence; the more especially as in the article upon his great assailant, Savonarola, in a former number,* we abstained from any partial examination of the charges popularly preferred against him, in order that the whole subject might come in a complete form before the view of the reader. He is chiefly calumniated on account of his pursuing the course of which the blame is first ascribed to Sixtus, but a blame which he must share, if he deserves it, with other and earlier pontiffs, never stigmatized as “bad popes;” such for example as Gregory IX.—We speak of the efforts to regain or defend the temporal possessions of the Church. Except with respect to his natural children, of whom we will speak hereafter, this is the sole or almost the sole burden of reproach upon Alexander VI., and certainly it is the sole cause of it: for his energetic prosecution of the plans projected by his predecessor for the recovery of the patrimony of the Church, raised him the hatred of her princely plunderers and the herd of writers whom they patronized; and as the passion for political power in those days infected, as we shall see, even the breasts of pious friars, the political alliances or enmities in which he was involved, and the cloud of calumny in which he was inclosed, exposed him to the exaggerated or inflamed accusations of some of a nobler character, and among others of the celebrated Savonarola.

With the character of Savonarola that of Alexander is eternally associated. We must begin by protesting against the justice of this association. It by no means follows that if Alexander were not a bad pope, Savonarola incurred the guilt of a calumniator. It is quite possible to suppose that Savonarola might have been deceived, without supposing that he was a deliberate slanderer. Now this is the view which we purpose to substantiate. Of the earnestness, sincerity, devotedness, and enthusiastic asceticism of Savonarola’s early career, we have spoken on a former occasion. But it now becomes our painful duty to follow him through the unhappy wanderings of his later life. It must not be forgotten that these are the very qualities which might naturally lead into extreme and exaggerated views. From the moment when Savonarola identified himself with the public affairs of Florence, he came to identify Alexander, and in him the

See of Rome with the political party to which he was opposed. Partisan intemperance came to the aid of religious enthusiasm, and was, in its turn, reacted upon by the very enthusiasm which it inflamed. He lent his ear, thenceforth, to the enemies of Alexander; he speaks from that moment only as their organ and exponent; and his statements, at first earnest and enthusiastic, but for this very reason, the more likely to run into exaggeration, gradually lapse into downright fanaticism, till in the end they lose all title to be received as the testimony of an impartial witness.

Indeed, we need not go far to look for examples for the eager impetuosity with which he caught up every hostile representation against the conduct and character of this Pontiff. We saw, in a former article, how, in justification of resistance to the Pope's authority, he pleaded the invalidity of his title to the Papacy. This plea, of course, rested on the obligation which has so often since been repeated, that Alexander VI. owed his election to bribery. The story is told with a show of circumstantiality. The bribes and the bribed are alike specified. For instance, (to select a single one,) it is stated by Guicciardini, that Ascanio Sforza was bribed by the gift of Borgia's private palace. Unfortunately for the story, however, it appears that the palace was given to Battista Orsini. Now, the falsehood of one part of a story so circumstantial, goes far to cast discredit on the rest. But this is not all. There is a probability from plain facts, of a natural and laudable reason for these supposed gifts. One of the Sforza family, and one of the Orsini, were Alexander's generals; and what more reasonable than that he should reward members of great houses in whom he reposed such confidence, and whom he commissioned for such services? It is Guicciardini who loads Alexander with wholesale abuse, and it is no more possible to place reliance on the assertions of Guicciardini, than on the statements of Machiavelli. All the accusations against Alexander, so far as relates to his conduct after his elevation to the Holy See, will, if carefully scrutinized, be found tainted with inconsistency or incredibility. His care to provide for his bastard children, as they are coarsely called, is made the chief matter of charge against him, with no care to examine whether they were not his lawful children by a marriage before he entered the priesthood; or if not, whether they were not

born many long years before his elevation to the Papacy—and whether that had not been followed by an alteration of character, which would not certainly have been indicated by his neglect and disregard of those who could scarcely have shared a criminality which preceded their own existence.

It may be necessary to premise a few observations as to the calumnies on the character of Alexander. He probably *had* been a profligate, but it was while he was in the army; and in an age of profligacy it was not wonderful that a soldier should have a mistress. This seems to have been the extent of his depravity, which is not only greatly exaggerated as to its degree, but as to its duration. It is always spoken of as transcending all the ordinary bounds of human debauchery, and as continuing down to the very period of his papacy; nay, as rising then, if possible, to a higher pitch of atrocity than ever. Probably, there never was so gigantic a calumny. He shared with some of the most illustrious saints of the Church the shame of early profligacy—before he entered into the prelacy. It is said that he secretly continued the same life afterwards, but of that there is no credible evidence—there is only the testimony of those enemies of his or of the Papacy, whose mendacity in other respects is clearly established. We repeat, there is no credible proof that he was profligate after he entered into the prelacy or the Papacy. His chief calumniator is Guicciardini, and he is obliged to admit, that in Alexander there was “singular acuteness and sagacity, excellence in council, and in all weighty matters incredible concentration of ideas and astuteness.” Strange qualities for an impersonation of beastly debauchery, and for one degraded below the level of the brute. But we will enable our readers perfectly to appreciate Guicciardini. In order to impress all men with an idea of the unfitness of Alexander for the Papacy, he says that his election was disliked, partly on account of his “nature and qualities, which were known to many—and to one in particular—the King of Naples, who expressed his sorrow with tears.” This is gravely quoted by Dr. Madden. Now, Ferdinand of Naples had ample reason to feel a sorrow on account of the election of Alexander, “because of his nature and qualities;” assuming Alexander to have been what the historian describes him—as “of singular acuteness and sagacity”—“marvellous excellence in council, and incredible

astuteness ;" for, Ferdinand was one of the most unscrupulous assailants of the Papacy—one who was for ever intriguing to rob the Church of part of her patrimony, and whose sorrow, therefore, at the election of so able a Pontiff was the sorrow of a spoliator at the appointment of a powerful and skilful protector to defend, and deprive him of, his anticipated prey. It is the very historian who records the tears of sorrow which Ferdinand felt at the election of Alexander, who also records the intrigues which Ferdinand had engaged in with Pietro de Medici, to get one of the Orsini possession of certain castles adjacent to the Pontifical territory, "for he considered it would be advantageous to him to have Orsini, who was a military man, and also a relative of his, in possession of such strongholds near Rome. For he always looked on the power of the Popes as capable of being made instruments of mischief to the peace of his kingdom, which was an ancient fief of the Holy See, and which extended for a great many miles along the borders of the ecclesiastical states." And the historian adds, "that he always made it a principal point in his policy to keep all, or at least the chief of the Roman barons under his controul." It is easy to appreciate the "tears of sorrow" shed by this politic prince at the election of a Pope of "marvellous excellence in council, and wonderful astuteness and sagacity." He saw he should have his match, and should not find it any easy task to attempt to overreach or to rob the Papacy.

Let us look a little into the aspect of Italian politics under the Popedom of Alexander. The Borgias were a new and rising family ; a fact not sufficiently attended to, as accounting for their being the objects of universal envy, enmity, and jealousy, especially when pursuing a policy which peculiarly exposed them to the rage of those who now could not rob the Church with impunity. The more ancient and powerful houses of the Orsini and Colonnese were arrayed against him ; his own subjects intriguing with Ferdinand of Naples to assail and despoil him. The Orsini were assisted by Ferdinand to purchase certain fiefs within the Roman territory, in order to aid them in their common purpose of embarrassing and embroiling the Pontiff. "These places," says Mr. Napier, "were, as well as most of the Orsini states, situated about Rome, Viterbo, and Civita Vecchio, and maintained a line of political intercourse with Naples ; and the Pope thus saw

himself bearded in the heart of his dominions, by one of the most powerful barons, supported by two unfriendly states in close family connection, for Orsino was related to Naples; and it had always been one of Ferdinand's objects to possess some strongholds in the Papal territory that might connect him with the factions.” Here is the case stated by a Protestant historian. And is it not palpable that the Pope was put upon the defensive—by misconceptions, aggression, and traitorous machination? In self-defence he assembled his forces—married Lucrezia, his natural daughter (before he was Pope) to the lord of Pesaro, who commanded them, and prepared to attack Orsino. In so doing he was acting most truly as a Pastor: he was rescuing his sheep from the wolves—his subjects from oppression. Ferdinand of Naples, in concert with Florence, attacked the territories of the Holy See, and Milan, its ally, invoked the aid of France, and brought down on Italy Charles of Anjou.

Now, who were the causes of all the disasters that ensued? Clearly the aggressors. And who were they? Clearly the unprincipled and rapacious Ferdinand and his equally unscrupulous allies, the Florentines. It was at this very period the influence of Savonarola was all-powerful in Florence, and so far from his influence being exerted against this unjust aggression on the part of his country, plain facts prove that he was its main mover. In other words, he was aiding and abetting an atrocious tyrant in an unscrupulous aggression on the proper rights and possessions of the Holy See. In short, he was, so far, a leader of rebels against the Holy See of Rome; not merely rebels, but robbers, leagued with one of the most ruffianly princes of the age, to rob and plunder the See of St. Peter. In our former article on Savonarola, it was shown that at this period he was certainly in a state of disobedience to the Holy See which could not be justified, and had imagined himself entrusted with a Divine mission and supernatural inspirations. It is into this portion of his extraordinary career that we now propose to pursue the melancholy narrative. In order to judge dispassionately of his portraiture of Alexander VI., it will be necessary to enter fully into every particular of his history; and we regret to say that it is impossible to study his character in this period of his life, without a painful conviction of the peril to which even the loftiest piety and the

purest purposes are exposed, under the influence of political excitement and popular applause. It is, however, in no spirit of scorn we desire to speak of that illustrious and ill-fated man; and we should check the inclination to do so, provoked by the misrepresentations of those who, in their haste to calumniate a Pontiff, heap indiscriminating eulogies on a demagogue. For, whatever Savonarola might have been, at an earlier period of his life, (and then we are sure that if not a saint, he was in the way to have become one,) at the time of which we now speak, he was merely an agitator, a schismatic, and a fanatic. He was in open rebellion against the Holy See, (as was shown by the writer of the article in Number lxxiii.); and we shall see how he loaded his soul with the guilt of *murder* (at least by assent) in the wild pursuit of power. His was a noble soul: but so was Lucifer's: and he fell like Lucifer, by reason of that first and last of sins—“that last infirmity of noble minds”—the sin of pride. The ruin of such a soul is a theme for angels' tears; and the fate of such a man a fitting subject only for deep sorrow. In the whole of history we know not a more mournful and melancholy tragedy.* But there are stern lessons which truth must deduce from it, yet the requisitions of justice must be satisfied; nor must we suffer a false charity, or simulated candour to exalt one character for the purpose of degrading another. The truth must be spoken—the proofs we shall disclose—the plain fact is, that at this period Savonarola was an excited fanatic, had long been an agitator, and had ended with being an avowed schismatic.

Thus it happened that, from a variety of causes, the political sympathies of this enthusiastic man were all enlisted against the political position, in relation to Italian affairs, then occupied by the Papacy. Unfortunately, too, the character of Savonarola is inseparably associated with the character of the Papacy in his day; for this,

* We cannot help alluding to a strange fallacy of the admirers of Savonarola. They exult in this supposed fact, that St. Philip Neri kept his picture. Assuming this fact to be (as it is not) by any means adequately attested—can they venture to say that it was for veneration, or for warning? or if by way of veneration, was it for his *original* or his *ultimate* character?

among other reasons, that he constituted himself a witness against it. It is with him as with Wycliffe in England in that respect. In his later writings are to be found the most sweeping denunciations of the prelacy, the papacy, and the priesthood, of his age,—and he has, perhaps, more than any other, contributed to create the deep-seated impression which prevails as to the depravity of the Pontiffs and prelates of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries,—the centuries as to which historical truth is so important, seeing that they preceded that disastrous religious revolution—the Reformation. “Popes,” he said, in the violent declamation of this period of his career, “have attained, through the most shameful simony and subtlety, the highest priestly dignity, and even when seated on the holy chair, surrender themselves to a shamefully voluptuous life and insatiable avarice. The cardinals and bishops follow their example. *No discipline in fear of God* is in them. Many believe in no God. The chastity of the cloister is slain, and they who should serve God with holy zeal have become cold or lukewarm.” The obvious import of this sort of language—the language he ordinarily held, was, that this depravity was not exceptional, but general and universal. Now his own admirers admit that these sweeping demonstrations are utterly false; and their falsehood can plainly be proved from the facts of contemporary history and biography. Dr. Madden, whose admiration of his hero almost amounts to infatuation, admits this, and writes with great good sense in these terms by way of apology for such indiscriminating calumny. “It cannot fail to strike the readers of works of ascetic writers how the denunciation of universal iniquity becomes a ruling passion, so that they are apt to become forgetful of many exceptions to the prevailing degeneracy and corruption. We may be permitted to doubt if all religion had perished, or all its ministers had become faithless and unprofitable servants in Italy in the days of Savonarola.” Now we attribute the impression so prevalent, that it was such an age, chiefly to these very exaggerations of Savonarola, and other less sincere and single-minded writers, principally secular, who had political objects to promote by these denunciations of ecclesiastical contemporaries. And we submit that a man who could permit himself to publicly preach such mischievous representations which his own

admirers admit to be sweeping and excessive exaggerations, *is not a credible witness.*

It is plain, indeed, that the leading defect of Savonarola's mind was want of self-control. He knew no moderation. He ran into extremes, even in reference to the common decencies of society. It was in the year 1490, that, at the request of Lorenzo de Medici, Savonarola was sent from Ferrara, and appointed Prior of the Convent of St. Marco, in Florence, of which Lorenzo was the patron, as he was of the city really the Prince. From the very first, as we saw in our former article, Savonarola treated him with a marked hostility, and even bitterness, of which we find no previous instance in his conduct to others, and for which it is hard to find an excuse. In the words of Dr. Madden, "Savonarola was informed that it was customary with all Superiors of Convents in Florence, on their appointment to the office of Prior, to make a formal visit to Lorenzo de Medici, as a recognition of his legitimate authority in his capacity as the head of the republic, and for the purpose of recommending to his protection their several Convents." But we learn from Burlammacchi, (a great eulogist of Savonarola,) "that he would do none of these things, at which the brethren were much surprised; and the brethren of longest standing in the Convent said to him, 'Such being the custom, in accordance with it, you ought to make this visit of ceremony, or otherwise great scandal will arise;' to which he answered: 'Who elected me Prior? God, or Lorenzo? It is the Lord I wish to thank, not mortal man.'" Now Lorenzo had *recommended* him to be appointed, and *requested* his appointment, and surely deserved, for this courtesy, a "customary visit of ceremony," especially as he was virtually sovereign of the city and state of Florence. Nor can we, when we recollect that the family of Lorenzo were founders of the Convent, and that he was its patron, fail to sympathize with his feelings when he said: "A foreign Prior has come to take up his abode in my house, and he will not deign to make me a visit!" However, Lorenzo, undeterred by this stern discourtesy, *went to see Savonarola.* Again and again he walked (as was usual) in the Convent Garden, hoping that the Prior would speak to him. But no. Savonarola wrapt himself up in stern isolation; and although Lorenzo left untried no means to soften him, and show his desire to be friendly with him, all he could

get was cold and curt replies to his kind courtesies, and repulsion and repugnance to all his charitable civilities. Now part of this proceeding is certainly to be ascribed to the rigid anti-Erastian notions which Savonarola entertained, and which he had come to Florence to enforce with all his characteristic ardour. But a great deal of it, too, arose from the same party-spirit of which we have been speaking. Lorenzo had his faults, perhaps his crimes, we are no enthusiastic eulogists of him, but his rule was received by the great body of his countrymen, and is recognized by the greatest writers of our own, or any other age, as on the whole salutary and just. His private character was reputable, his patronage of literature generous; his benefactions to religion showed a sense of piety, and spirit of devotion; and the charity and humility he displayed towards the man who treated him so uncharitably, towards one who was a recipient of the bounty of his family, and owed his position to his patronage, evinced that, with less of pretension to piety, he possessed more of the *magnanimous*, as well as the *magnificent*. He evinced no resentment at the rude treatment of Savonarola, and gave him no molestation; on the contrary, treated him with constant courtesy. The reward he received was systematic denunciation, and persevering enmity. Perpetually preaching, the Prior found a familiar theme in the regret of political liberty; and the drift of his discourses was opposition to the rule of Lorenzo, and dislike to the existing form of government in Florence.

It is impossible not to perceive that the pious monk had become smitten by the prevalent passion of the age, and especially of his own people, the passion for political power. In effect he played the part of an agitator. It is easy to say "that the monk of Ferrara, who began, we are told, at this time to show that he was ambitious, a self-seeker, ought, if his character and conduct are rightly represented, to make his court with the chief of the state, from whom all honour, wealth, and dignities, in the republic were to be derived." But we ask in return: is it of *princes* that patriots seek power? Is it not rather of the *people*? And is it not essential, in order to acquire popularity, to stand aloof from, and affect dislike and distrust for the *rulers*? Is not a haughty independence, a spirit of defiance towards those in power, the common policy of those who *desire to obtain* power, by acquiring

the reputation of despising it? Political preaching, of which the theme was popular liberty, were likelier means of acquiring popular influence than paying court to a prince; and discourses against tyranny the best and surest mode of winning popularity. It is not surprising that there were remonstrances against this style of preaching, and that its motives and aims were suspected. It is the more observable because, although in another year or two we find Savonarola a fierce declaimer against the Court of Rome, under Alexander VI., we find him now rather an assistant of the Medici, and hear nothing of Sixtus. Was this the reason, that Sixtus was at enmity with the Medici, whereas Alexander was in alliance with that illustrious house?

Anyhow, no admirer or defender of Savonarola can deny or dispute the fact that, from this time forward, he was a political agitator, and that his efforts were directed to a change of the form of Florentine government. For he himself avowed it, and evinced the aim and motive of his conduct at a moment, and under circumstances, when, if it had not been the force of a dominant passion which moved him, the decencies of humanity, the dictates of piety, and the duties of charity, would have kept him silent on the subject; but these were outraged and violated by his conduct. When the great Lorenzo lay on his death-bed, and humbled himself so far as to send for the friar, who had, during the whole period of his residence in the house which the kindness of Lorenzo had obtained him, pursued him with relentless rancour, Savonarola refused absolution or benediction except on three conditions, one of which was, that he should restore to Florence *the state of popular rule which belonged to a republic!* It is absolutely astounding that the admirers of Savonarola should be so carried away by their enthusiasm as not to be sensible of the inhumanity, the indecency, the impiety of this. Who made Savonarola the arbiter of the political rule of Florence, and by what code of theology does he make a republican system essential to salvation? How engrossed his whole soul must have been by political theories, to have made such an insolent requisition at the death-bed of an illustrious prince, who had acquired his power by no conquest save that of superior ability, and held it with the assent of the great majority of his countrymen.

Lorenzo, however, died ; and about the same time died Innocent VIII., (the successor of Sixtus,) whom Alexander VI. succeeded in the See of Rome. Alexander, who was on friendly terms with the family of the Medici, was at once involved in a contest for part of the patrimony of the Church, which exposed him to the enmity of several of the princes of Italy ; while poor Pietro, the son and successor of Lorenzo, found himself unable to face the fury of popular *liberty*, created by the political preaching of the friar. At the same period the Borgias were embarked in a war, (for self-defence,) and the Medici were involved in ruin, Savonarola the enemy of both. The palace of the Medici was sacked in a burst of popular rage, kindled and fanned by his influence ; and in that palace he, not long after, sat to sanction the murder of the friends of the family under whose patronage he first entered Florence ; and subsequently it was there that he waited on a fierce and ferocious king, invited into Italy, its scourge and curse, at his earnest instigation, in order to coerce, and, if possible, displace the Vicar of Christ. Let us look a little more closely into these passages of history ; they are closely connected. It happened that one of the supposed prophecies of Savonarola was the ruin of Pietro de Medici, the son of his benefactor and friend ; and certainly he did his best to verify it, principally by his intrigues with that infamous prince, Charles VIII. of France, by whose act he hoped to destroy the Pope. With marvellous fatuity his admirers repeat his "predictions" of an invasion which their hero had done and was doing his best to accelerate, and had long led his hearers to anticipate these "predictions ;" indeed, at the same time we find Savonarola was sending letters to Charles, and to other personages, doubtless including the "eminent ecclesiastics" before alluded to, in order to induce him to invade Italy, overawe Florence, advance on Rome, and thus at once realize the predictions of the prophet, promote his schemes of political power, and wreak his revenge upon a Pontiff who did not favour those schemes, and showed symptoms of a desire to discountenance his political preachings, and investigate his pretended gifts. But first we find Savonarola engaged in transactions nearer home. It is made no secret of by the admirers of Savonarola that he was on good terms with the infamous Charles of Anjou.

Very early in the Italian career of that monarch, we find Girolamo at the head of an embassy composed, as Mr. Napier remarks, of the citizens "most adverse to the Medicean power," waiting on the French king; and the observation made as to the composition of the embassy, sufficiently indicates its character and its object. It was moved by envy against the house of the Medici, and sought the aid of Charles to overpower it. He had long been indefatigable in his endeavours to bring down Charles on Italy, thinking it would—as it did—favour his schemes of political power, and enable him to supplant the hated family of the Medici. And it was in reference to this invasion that he appears most prominently to have assumed that gift of prophecy which forms so painful a feature in his conduct, because it is the last and most melancholy phase in his wild career of fanaticism. Pietro de Medici then ruled in Florence. Savonarola had long striven to supplant Lorenzo; he had been foiled by the father; perhaps he might succeed against the son. Pietro was not in league with the invader. Savonarola *was*. His fellow-citizens supposed precisely the reverse. They did not know his secret communications with the French invader. He allowed Pietro to do his best to make terms for Florence; then, by reason of his services, Charles managed to make better; and next, by his friends, so worked upon the people, for several years before excited by his continual preachings against the rule of the Medici, that they rose in one of their wild bursts of popular frenzy, seized on and sacked the palace of that illustrious family, and expelled the son of Lorenzo from the city they had embellished.

And now Savonarola had gained his object. The republican form of government was re-established in Florence. This was on the 9th November, 1494. In less than four years the retribution came—and in a similar burst of popular fury Savonarola perished. Of course the friends of the Medici were not disposed to acquiesce in their expulsion, and naturally enough became the enemies of Savonarola. Moreover, on recovering from their fury, the people were not satisfied with the result of their violent revolution. Dr. Madden sensibly enough observes, "The expectations of the people by whom revolutions have been made, and the form of govern-

ment altered, are always of a nature that render it impossible that they can be realized ;” not perceiving that thereby he pronounced the condemnation of the folly of Savonarola for labouring for years to bring about such a revolution. He adds, with remarkable candour, “The interposition of Savonarola in secular affairs, though intended by him to promote spiritual interests, produced results that were *ultimately favourable only to a faction.*”

Very soon it appears, even the republican rulers who had been placed in his power by his preaching, began to complain of it. Most improperly political must have been its character to provoke such an interposition upon the part of those who had so profited by it. Yet the Gonfalonier was the first to promote proceedings against him on that account. The fact is, it was plain that Savonarola at Florence wanted to play in this respect the part of Calvin at Genoa.

Now, let us look a little to the circumstances attending the invasion of Italy by Charles VIII. of France, which has so important a bearing upon the character of Alexander and Savonarola. No one can question what kind of character was Charles. When, therefore, we read, as Corso says, that he had concerted with several of the most eminent ecclesiastics to deprive Alexander of the pontifical dignity, not only by the employment of force, but by the convocation of a council for the purpose of his deposition—a proceeding we need scarcely say, as insolently schismatical as any that had ever been attempted by Henry IV. of Germany, by Philip-le-Bel of France, or by Henry VIII. of England, we can easily conceive that one so impious and unscrupulous would stick at no means, however profligate, for the accomplishment of his ends, and that the “ecclesiastics” and writers in his interest would resort to the most envenomed and malignant slanders to blacken the character of the Pontiff they had schismatically conspired to depose. What mission had the French king or the “eminent ecclesiastics” to invoke a council? What cared he, or they, for simony or depravity—he among the most depraved persons of the age—and they, if his charges were true, the very men who had simoniacally elected Alexander? It is obvious that the extravagant accusations against Alexander were pretences to disguise the real object of the conspiracy for his deposition; temporal aggrandizement, which Charles

as much hoped to facilitate by the substitution of a more subservient Pontiff, as Philip-le-Bel had hoped in the case of Boniface VIII. And in the unprincipled aggression of princes like Ferdinand of Naples, and Charles of France, we see the real source of the slanders upon the Pontiff whose abilities they feared.

Yet, even Dr. Madden is compelled to admit “that the qualifications of the king of France to *pronounce judgment on the faith or morals of a pontiff were more than doubtful*,” adding, “that eminent prelates and dignitaries sought his aid and co-operation for the execution of their project to depose Alexander seems to allow of no doubt.” None at all. Now, as they knew the infamous character and unscrupulous aims of Charles, whose aid they sought, and as among the means the conspirators used, were the most atrocious slanders—slanders of which, the absurd incredibility of some, and the contradictory character of others, and the proved and palpable falsehood of several, cast discredit on the rest, and sufficiently show the character of the assailants,—what can we think of the “eminent ecclesiastics” who were the coadjutors of a prince such as Charles—for a purpose so schismatical—pursued by means so infamous and unscrupulous? And among them was Savonarola. Thus it is that the character and career of this remarkable man is associated so inseparably with those of Charles, on the one side, and of Alexander on the other; and, as we shall soon see, also intimately mixed up with the fate and fortunes of the family to whom he owed his introduction to Florence, and the influence he had ever used against them.

Audin, in his *Histoire de Leon X.*, gives us the true clue to the hatred entertained against Alexander, when he records, that soon after the death of his predecessor, more than two hundred homicides were committed within the walls of Rome, *by two or three families*, who had the privilege of shedding blood with impunity, because, practically, Rome belonged to them. He gives the reasons: “The long sojourn of the popes at Avignon,” one of the worst results of the fatal schism in the Papacy, (mainly brought about by the intrigues of secular princes,) “the schism that had broken out on their return to Italy, and the scandalous disputes of the council at Basle,” chiefly caused by the same evil influences, “had admirably served the purposes of the great vassals of the Holy See. Shel-

tered from punishment these feudatories had constituted themselves independent sovereigns.” Now, Alexander, the Pontiff, of marvellous sagacity and astuteness, was not the sort of man to suffer this shameful system, while, as we have seen, the princes of other neighbouring countries were willing enough that it should continue, as theirs was the *parricidal* policy of perpetuating divisions in Rome for the purpose of weakening the Papacy. Thus, says Audin, when Charles VIII. invaded Italy, most of the great lords came to offer their services to the conqueror. It was not the fault of Alexander that Charles crossed the Alps. We know now, thanks to the learned researches of Roscinini, that the Pope tried in vain to hinder the alliance of Sforza with Charles VIII., and proposed a triple alliance with Rome, Milan, and Naples, which would have rendered the invasion impossible.

Two powerful houses hastened by their defection the occupation of Rome, namely, the Colonnas and the Orsini, and delivered up by a base treachery the patrimony of St. Peter to the French. In all emergencies the Orsini and the Colonnas were sure to find a refuge in the State of Venice, for the policy of that republic was ever interested in having Rome under the government of a weak and infirm pope. Ah! and it was the “policy” of other states besides Venice,—the “policy”—the parricidal policy of all the states of Italy by turns. Florence, Venice, Milan, and Naples—all plunderers of the patrimony of St. Peter, or ready to be so, or, at least, to make use of it for the purposes of their political intrigues and petty plans of self-aggrandizement. Among these men was the lot of Alexander cast. Is it not easy to understand how and why they must have disliked so able a Pontiff, one so disposed to defend the territory of the Church, and repel their unscrupulous assaults? Roscoe tells us that Charles was invited into Italy by Sforza, and others of these unscrupulous princes. The Abbé Rohrbacher tells a similar story, and justly speaks of the cardinals, (the *majority* of the college mark,) who went over to Charles, as *traitors*. Most truly are they so described, for if their charge of simony was not false, they must, being the majority, have been implicated in the guilt; so that they were either simonists or slanderers, and in either case, traitors. And yet Dr. Madden, who tells his readers that Charles never would have invaded Italy if it had not

been “ for the efforts made by a large number of the cardinals to induce him to remove the unworthy Pontiff from the throne,” would have his readers to believe that these hypolitical conspirators were actuated by zeal for the honour of the Church !

In 1494 we find a tumult at Florence, (doubtless with the concurrence of Savonarola,) in which the Medici power is prostrated, and his envy of it satiated ; and soon after we find that their magnificent palace was sold by order of the government, (with whom Savonarola was then most influential,) and sacked by the followers of the king of France, his chosen champion, the monarch he selected as the *champion of Christendom* ! an unprincipled plunderer, a wicked and depraved man, in comparison of whom the worst Pope who ever reigned was a saint.

Savonarola was now all-powerful in Florence. Let us remark this. Mr. Napier himself, who, like all Protestants, (as well as candid Catholics,) is an admirer of Savonarola, says : “ He had gained the name of a prophet,” (by foretelling things, as Mr. Napier adds very shrewdly, which he might without any prophetic inspiration have foreseen,) and in the assembly held this same year, 1494, to resettle the government, his influence mainly determined the form of constitution agreed upon. Mr. Napier says most truly, “ Like the Calvin of after days, Savonarola *bent the public mind to his will by working on their superstition.* ” And though the historian adds, that, unlike Calvin, he was not a “ harsh and sanguinary bigot,” we shall soon show that in his day of power he became so. After the government was settled under his auspices, and his friend Valori made “ Gonfalonier,” Mr. Napier tells us that “ great discontent was produced by seeing an undue share of office and authority distributed among the followers of Savonarola ; ” and the chiefs of the Medicean party, whom he had caused to be exiled, of course panted to return. The natural consequence was a conspiracy,—perfectly justifiable,—a conspiracy on the part of exiles to recover their country, whence they had been unjustly expelled, merely from motives of envy and jealousy, and personal malignity. The conspiracy was discovered ; their friends in Florence, who were implicated in it, were detected ; five of the chiefs were arrested, and Savonarola, and his friend Valori, took a bloody vengeance. Although there

was so utter an absence of anything worthy of death, that the Priors were against their condemnation, Valori, (who was so intimate a friend of Savonarola, that although the latter is not seen in the foreground, the acts of the one were really those of the other,) by the most energetic exertions, by a system of intimidation and excitement, by menaces and by appeals to the mob, pursued the unfortunate victims to the scaffold, and rested not until they were executed. Very truly does Mr. Napier say, "he lived to pay a bloody forfeit for his work." And so did Savonarola, and quite as justly. For the murder of these unhappy men he was as much responsible as Valori, his intimate associate, who by his personal exertions had encompassed the bloody deed; and the one as well as the other were as criminal for it as if they had actually committed it. They did not merely put the law in motion, (cruel as it was, even that would have been criminal,) but they carried their cruelty—remorseless and heartless—beyond the law; they coerced the judges, they menaced them, they compelled them to a sentence of condemnation against their convictions. Who dare say that under such circumstances an execution was not a murder? Then of that morally Savonarola was guilty, and it sat heavy on his soul.

And can it be marvelled at that in this state of things the failure of Savonarola's appeal to the fiery ordeal, should have caused an explosion of public rage, at what was now universally believed to be a detected imposture, and that amidst a tempest of popular fury, Savonarola and Valori should have suffered the death which a few short months before they had cruelly inflicted on five citizens, whose only crime was seeking to restore their exiled friends to home?

Surely these things are not wonderful; but what is wonderful, and something more pitiable, is to find "candid" Catholics imputing these things to the Popedom, and ascribing the death of Savonarola to the vengeance of Alexander, and exalting him as a confessor and martyr. He was as much a martyr as Cæsar, and as much a confessor as Charles. He met the doom of those who use the sword and come to perish by the sword; he had become an intemperate fanatic, a combination of Calvin and Cromwell, all the unbending rigour of the one, and all the remorseless puritanism of the other, a stern and sanguinary zealot. His friend, Charles VIII., died about

the same time. His character no one doubts. And Savonarola always held him up as "*a divine instrument*," (Mr. Napier's words,) "*for the emancipation of Italy from corruption in ecclesiastical government.*" The Eighth Henry of England was just such another as the Eighth Charles of France, and we know what we think of the admirers of our Harry.

And this was the man who, a year or two ago, had declared war against music, and chess, and cards; had got up as a spectacle, a grand combustion of such things in the market-place of Florence; and thus won that reputation for sanctity, by which, in the words of Mr. Napier, like Calvin, he bent the public mind to his will, "by working on their superstition." Why how can it be wondered at that this conduct excited disgust among the educated and enlightened, although for some time the vulgar were, as they always are, the dupes of fanaticism; how can it be marvelled at, that when, as Mr. Napier justly says, "the alleged illegal condemnation of the free citizens who were pitied even by many among the ascendant faction," excited a strong feeling against him; how can it be wondered at that many should thirst to inflict on him the cruel scorn he had inflicted on others; how can it be marvelled at, that now especially as he had been first interdicted from preaching, next summoned to Rome, and then excommunicated for disobedience; how can it be wondered at that there should have arisen against him a deep, we will say a *deserved*, aversion and disgust; so that he was subjected to coarse indignities even while preaching, and visited with insults that showed that on the part of a large portion of the population, he was viewed with execration as a cruel but fallen fanatic?

The republic he cared not for unless he were its ruler. This was perceived, and of course gave his conduct the character of a self-seeking imposture, which revolted even his republican friends. What is far more important to remark, and is slurred over or suppressed by the admirers of Savonarola, is the striking fact that in 1495, two years after his prosecution, and only a single year after his rising to the highest influence in Florence, owing to the expulsion of the Medici, and the re-establishment of his favourite form of government, the whole of sixteen Dominican Masters in Theology (save one), the theologians of his own order, condemned Savonarola's preaching. It

must have been very unsound or very secular: and it was at this time, we are informed by Dr. Madden, that his language began to assume a more determined character of opposition to the Pope, Alexander VI. Why at "this time?" Plainly because those who were faithful to the Holy See, even the theologians of his own order, complained of and condemned his preaching, and, with the infallible instinct of incipient schism, he conceived apprehensions of the Holy See, although it had not yet spoken against him, and he contrived to seek to prejudice its voice when it did speak, by blackening its character and defaming its motives. Not until the middle of the year 1495 came the first citation from the Pope, couched, as Dr. Madden admits, in no unkindly terms,—indeed, as he adds, "*the probability is that at that time no unfriendly feelings were entertained by the Pope towards the friar.*" He utterly disregarded it. The end of the year saw him suspended from preaching. But the beginning of the next year saw his suspension removed *at the instigation of the magistracy of the city*. So that at this time his influence with the government was not gone. We pray our readers to remark this,—it will be found most important. He resumed preaching in 1496. At the end of that year came the second citation and suspension, and then an excommunication, which, however, was not for a year after published, on account of his influence with the government; for so late as July we find the Signoria remonstrating against it. At the carnival of that year so powerful had been his influence that the celebrated *auto-da-fe* of the societies of Florence, took place under his auspices amidst a fervour of enthusiasm almost amounting to frenzy. And not until the next year was his excommunication published. Now, mark. In August 1497 occurred the execrable murder of the five distinguished citizens of Florence, who were detected in an attempt to restore the Medici, so unjustly and ungratefully exiled. We have seen what the influence of Savonarola was with the rulers and people of Florence at that period. The most prominent actor in the murder of the so-called conspirators was Francesco de Vallori, the intimate ally of Savonarola, and he most unquestionably sanctioned and assented to, and never disapproved of or opposed the slaughter of the victims, whose friends threw themselves at the feet of the friar and his ally, imploring

mercy, but in vain. Yet Dr. Madden is so mistaken as to say, "at that time the power and influence of Savonarola in the government was gone, and he had no act or part in the proceedings." Our readers will now perceive why we have been so careful as to *dates*. There is irresistible force in truth, and one of its chief tests is the order of time.

Let us look at some of the details of this transaction as narrated by one on whom—albeit a Protestant, and a bitter foe of the Papacy—and thoroughly imbued with all the vulgar traditions as to the atrocity of Alexander—far more reliance can be placed than on Dr. Madden,—we mean Mr. Napier. That able writer, although an admirer of Savonarola, does not attempt to conceal, as does Dr. Madden, the friar's participation, by at least tacit consent, and implied acquiescence in the butchery of the five gentlemen who were executed for seeking to bring back the Medici. Be it recollected that Piero de Medici was attached to Alexander, and that his house had for years been the object of the animosity of Savonarola. The enmity of the latter to Piero and the Pope has a close connection of both feelings with his own passion for political power. The Seigniors were against the execution of a capital sentence on the unfortunate friends of Piero. Whose stern influence overawed them to a more sanguinary course? That of Francesco Vallori, the bosom friend—the intimate ally—of Savonarola. The foes of the Medici were the friends of Savonarola; the allies of Savonarola were the enemies of the Medici. Mr. Napier points out,* that when a law which had been enacted under the influence of Savonarola, stood in the way of the condemnation of the five accused, Francesco Vallori managed to get it set aside, with gross and shameless injustice in this particular instance; and he adds, with evident truth, leaning to Savonarola, "There was a loud and apparently an unjust outcry against Savonarola and his party," (we crave attention to these words,) "for allowing their own law to be infringed when it was likely to work in an enemies' favour."

Mr. Napier is so much an admirer of Savonarola, that he goes on to argue that this outcry was unjust, and that

* Hist. Florence, vol. iii. c. 7.

the law was justly altered to secure the condemnation of the accused, (a strange doctrine to British ears, and certainly one which would revolt a British lawyer, or a Catholic theologian); but that is not the point we are discussing, which is simply this, whether Savonarola was not *concerned* in the sanguinary transaction; and we have cited one of the most distinguished of our own historians of the time, and one very partial to Savonarola, to prove that he *was*. The remarkable expression he uses, as applied to the promoters of the prosecution, “*Savonarola and his party,*” sufficiently shows this, and also shows that Savonarola had a political party, which is what his opponents always complained of, and that for which, in reality, he met his unfortunate fate. The simple fact that Valori, the man to whom, as Mr. Napier clearly shows, the condemnation of the accused to death was entirely owing, was the intimate friend of Savonarola, affords ample evidence of the fact stated by Mr. Napier, and for which we have cited his authority, that Savonarola and his party were the promoters of a sanguinary proceeding, deemed unnecessary by the majority of the magistracy of Florence, and only assented to under absolute terror of the influence of “*Savonarola and his party.*” In the face of all this Dr. Madden assures his readers that Savonarola had no concern with the transaction, that his influence was gone. Why Mr. Napier tells us that although excommunicated in June of this year, (the transaction taking place in August,) “this adherent disregarded it,” and incited and urged by the government, he recommenced preaching in February 1498.

The pains taken by his admirers to deny and disguise their hero's participation in the affair, sufficiently show their own sense of its atrocity, while, on the other hand, their misrepresentations as to the influence of the rebellious friar even down to the commencement of 1498, after he had been thrice cited, and twice suspended, by the Holy See, after his sentence of excommunication had been passed upwards of a year, and even he had been publicly excommunicated for months—all this clearly exposes the falsity of Dr. Madden's representations, that the death of Savonarola was a crime chargeable on Alexander. The plain facts show that the magistracy and the people of Florence treated with contempt the spiritual weapons by which alone Alexander pursued the contumacious friar,

and that his death must be ascribed to other and purely local causes. That the Pope properly excommunicated him, and that his conduct was utterly indefensible, rebellious, and schismatical, is clearly shown in the article on Savonarola, written by one who is as sincere an admirer of the really brilliant qualities of the ill-fated Dominican as Dr. Madden himself, in the Review for October.

Mr. Napier shows, what hardly requires to be shown, that during the ten months which elapsed between the murder of the friends of the Medici by Savonarola and his party, in August 1497, to the execution of the friar and his friends in April, in the very next year, causes powerful enough were at work to procure the downfall of the sanguinary zealot. Had the friends of the murdered men no feelings of revenge? Did their blood not call for vengeance? And on whom should that vengeance fall but on Valori and Savonarola? Mr. Napier tells us that notwithstanding the seignior were in favour of Savonarola in 1497, in that very year there was such a feeling against him among the numerous friends of the Medici, that he was openly insulted in the pulpit. Let all those who, like Dr. Madden, are fond of railing against Alexander as the cause of the death of Savonarola, mark this significant sentence of Mr. Napier's. "The gonfalonier and members of the seignior for March and April, (1498) were enemies to Savonarola, and numbers of noble citizens still burned with indignation for the sacrifice of last year's victims, so that they moved heaven and earth to inflame the discontent against him; their hour of triumph was now come, and success was certain."

In the face of facts like these, facts palpable and flagrant, narrated by an able Protestant historian, is it not too bad for a Catholic writer to insist in casting on the Pontiffs the odium of the death of Savonarola, which was plainly the result of a reaction from his own political supremacy, and the revenge of the cruelty perpetrated by himself and his party? But this is not all that Mr. Napier tells. He says, "Both parties began to arm." "The adherents of Savonarola proposed to arm, especially Valori." In this state of the public mind occurs the miserable tragedy of the trial by fire, which kindled a flame of popular fury, under cover of which the friends of the Medici slew Savonarola, having first slain Valori. The circumstance is significant, for Savonarola and

Valori, as we have seen, had been the chief, the sole cause of the slaughter of the five citizens who sought the return of the Medici.

It matters not that ecclesiastical agencies were employed to compass the condemnation of the contumacious friar; that was in a certain sense essential, as he was a priest, and the object was his execution. The events of the preceding twelve months show that excommunication did not necessarily injure a man much in Florence so long as he was a favourite of the rulers and the people, and that they cared not a straw for citations or censures of the Holy See while Savonarola answered their ends or retained their favour; but the moment the re-action commenced against him, promoted by private revenge and political faction, and the explosion of popular fury at the failure of his last imposture, laid him at the mercy of his personal and political enemies, the ecclesiastical means were eagerly resorted to for his condemnation and execution, and "enlightened" Protestants and "candid" Catholics concur in casting on the Church all the odium of the transaction, and reviling the Holy See for the death of Savonarola, which was, whether merited or unmerited in an ecclesiastical or legal point of view, at all events a remarkable moral retribution, the manifest consummation of a career of turbulent agitation and an impressive commentary on the words of our Lord, that "they who use the sword must *perish* by the sword." This is the true story of Savonarola, and rightly considered it has nothing to do with the character of the Pontiff and throws no odium on Alexander. That Savonarola in a certain sense deserved his doom—that is, that he was a rebel in the Church and in the State—we think must plainly appear to the readers of the article in the *Review* of October, though that his shocking fate should provoke profound pity and regret no mind sensitive to the sorrows and errors of a noble nature will be induced to deny. In his sad fate we see fruits of that pride which is the last infirmity of noble minds, and weep over the ruin of a noble soul. But let us not permit ourselves in our pity for him to do injustice to others; above all, let us beware how we assail a Pontiff with unmerited revilings and cover calumny under the mask of charity.

It is to us a matter of painful *scandal* to see how easily, how eagerly, "candid" Catholics receive the most shocking charges against popes and prelates, unsupported

by any valid evidence whatever: we repeat, unsupported by any valid evidence at all. Except in the instance of some false and schismatic popes foisted on the faithful by rulers and princes, we know of no instance in which wicked conduct is brought home to a Pope by specific statements of writers of credit vouching the authority of witnesses of credit speaking to their own knowledge. Ought Catholics to receive and circulate scandalous charges against successors of St. Peter on any evidence less credible? Ought one who has held the Apostle's keys to be surrendered to obloquy and infamy in the absence of evidence as valid as could satisfy us on the character of a butler? The most serious statements affecting their character are often written without the pretence of authority, and are copied without hesitation or reflection, although written by violent partisans. For instance, some of the worst things as to Alexander in reference to Savonarola are written by Burlamacchi, a convert of Savonarola's and an enthusiastic admirer of him. And one of his statements, on what authority (says Dr. Madden) he does not mention, is, that the Cardinal of Sienna, afterwards Pope Pius III., wrote a letter from Rome to the father offering his good offices with the Pope (which is probably true enough) on condition of payment of a large sum of money. Now does any one believe this? Does Dr. Madden? Then why did he republish it? Is it necessary to show that it is a falsehood? Is it not on the face of it a falsehood? Is it not impossible that any prelate of the court of Rome should so commit himself to a man like Savonarola as to write such a letter? The truth no doubt is, that there was a letter written, kind and charitable, which the proud and obstinate friar rejected. Does any man believe that if Savonarola had received such a letter he would not have mentioned it publicly? It would have been a weapon against the Pope whom he had so furiously denounced infinitely more formidable than any he could lay hands upon. Yet not a word of it is heard, save from the lips of Burlamacchi, who takes care to assure his readers that he wrote concerning Savonarola the things he had seen with his eyes, or heard from his lips, or heard from other persons of veracity, or read in official documents. Had he seen or read this letter? Does any one believe that he had? If he had, can it be doubted he would have said so? Would any disciple of Savonarola have suppressed it had

he ever seen such a letter? The result of these enquiries surely must be—either a conviction that Savonarola, from whom alone directly or indirectly the statement could have come, was not a “person of veracity,” or at least a deep impression of the worthlessness of hearsay and exparte statements by partizan writers. Let it be observed that all the contemporary writers relied on for the statements favourable to Savonarola and hostile to Alexander were partizans or friends of Savonarola, Burlamacchi, Nardi, Mirandola. Let us look at a specimen of the way in which those men wrote—Burlamacchi tells us “that a chaplain of Monsieur Pandolf’s, who lodged with one of the commissaries of the Pope in Florence, related” (to whom?) “that the night before the death of Savonarola several citizens carried large sums of money to the commissary, and among the rest one person carried to him 1,000 ducats,” (for what?) “with which money he” (who?) “returned to Rome as it was reported,” (by whom? to whom?) “and bought a cardinal’s hat.” It was reported, however, says Burlamacchi, that he became ultimately repentant, but others of Savonarola’s admirers say he died a very miserable death, obviously implying impenitence, and none of them giving any idea what the poor man had to be particularly penitent for. We may say of these men as the Gospel historians say of our Lord’s accusers—“neither did their testimony agree together.” Did any one ever see such slipshod, such shuffling, such utterly disgraceful testimony, on which to brand and blacken the characters of popes and prelates? The object of this precious concoction is palpable; it is to produce an impression that Alexander was party to the death of Savonarola, and for that purpose (we grieve to say) gravely quoted by Dr. Madden, who surely could scarcely put reliance upon it! It is impossible to imagine a statement less worthy of respect. It is positively contemptible. It is rendered all the more contemptible from the very fact that the mention of the “Pope’s commissary” (one of whose functions was to receive the contributions to the Papal revenues in any cities where they resided), suggests the idea that there may have been, as there is in most instances of falsehood, some shadow of foundation for part of the statement, viz. that money was brought to the Papal commissary not only the night before the death of Savonarola, but on many other nights. And that is absolutely

the only fact that is distinctly to be collected from the statement as clearly averred even on hearsay, or rather report of hearsay. For this Burlamacchi, who assures us that he records nothing which he had not seen or heard from persons of veracity, does not say that on this or any other occasion it was not hearsay which he heard; and on this occasion all he says, even as to the sole fact distinctly reported, is—that some one had related to some one—who it was he says not, and it may have come to himself through six persons, distorted at each step of its progress. And as to the next, which is all mere matter of insinuation or suggestion, that one person, who “brought money,” (it is not said for what purpose, and it may have been quite lawful) “as it was reported, went to Rome and bought a cardinal’s hat.” It is consistent with what is said by Burlamacchi, that he merely heard from some one that there was such a report; and what is hearsay evidence of a report worth, the hearsay and the report alike emanating from heated partisans? Such are the sort of statements on which “candid” Catholics blacken the characters of pontiffs.

With such Catholics as these, any writer who testifies against a Pope is cordially credited; but any statement, even of the very same writer, in favour of papacy is rejected. When Machiavelli testifies against a Borgia he is quoted with eagerness; when he speaks against Savonarola he is disregarded. When Audin praises Leo X. for having prevented the part of Savonarola being played over again in the pulpit of Florence, by a friar who seemed desirous to emulate him, and issued a brief against pretended prophecies, Dr. Madden indignantly draws attention to the fact that Leo was a son of Lorenzo de Medici, and a brother of Piero, whose downfall was attributed by the Medici to Savonarola; and when Burlamacchi is quoted as narrating how Julius II. declared himself favourably of Savonarola, we are not reminded that Julius, when cardinal, had been opposed to Alexander and endeavoured to oppose him. When Bayle says anything against a Pope, he is carefully copied as a writer of credit by the candid Catholic; but when he exposes the impostures of Savonarola, he is stigmatized as a sceptic. Is not this something more than literary unfairness? Is it not simply scandalous? Should the characters of pontiffs be dealt with in a spirit so studiously unfair and

systematically unjust? All the shocking statements of Muratori or Guicciardini as to the conduct of the Borgias are recorded with minuteness, with no care to dissect their testimonies or discover their inconsistencies, while the refutations supplied by the learned and impartial researches of Roscoe are summarily and disrespectfully discarded. Is this creditable to a Catholic writer? Could he be ignorant of the influences under which the Italian historians wrote? Could he be unaware that they were under the patronage and often in the pay of the princes, those plunderers of the Church, against whose spoliations it was the fate of the Borgias to struggle? As we have seen, the Colonnas and the Orsini were in league with the enemies of the Holy See, striving to dispossess her of her patrimony, they were described as the victims of the Borgias. And then to envenom the accusations against him, these children are described as monsters of depravity, as incarnations of unutterable wickedness; while he is painted as the instigator of their iniquity and the accomplice of their crimes. Now in dealing with such a system of accusation, if some of its chief parts are proved slanderous the whole may fairly be presumed a fabrication of falsehood, as all rests on the same testimony. And in effecting this demolition there can be no difficulty. As respects Cæsar Borgia, his vindication rests on the same foundation as that which supports the character of the Popes for several centuries against similar accusations. They were assailed by unscrupulous enemies, and they defended themselves. Alexander was encompassed, like the rest, by malignant enemies, and Cæsar was his general. Let us read one chapter in his history—one of the darkest—as told by a bitter foe of the Papacy, the unprincipled Machiavelli. “A relation of the murder of Vitellozzi, Vitelli, Oliveretto, Cardinal Capalo, and the Duke de Gravina, committed by Cæsar Borgia, commonly called the Duke Valentino.” “The Duke had resolved upon an expedition against Bologna, of which the Vitelli, the Orsini, and their followers being apprised, they agreed that the Duke had usurped too great power” (that is in their opinion, his rivals and foes) “and that upon capturing Bologna, it might be concluded that his intention was to put them to death;” whereupon they held a diet “and held it expedient to curtail him in time,” that is to say, to cut him off; for in those days that was the real result of

such resolves as those. The logic of these sanguinary gentlemen was characteristic of tyrants and bandits as they were. They wanted an excuse for attacking Borgia, to cover the real motives — rapacity and jealousy. The excuse they devised was that he would be disposed to destroy them: that is, they wanted to kill him, and they chose to suppose that he wanted to kill them. He discovered their designs, and to prevent his own destruction had to destroy them. And this Machiavelli calls a murder, because it was committed by Borgia; and what would he have said had it been by the Medicis?

It was against the Colonna, the Savelli, and the Orsini that Cæsar Borgia waged his war, feudatories of the Church (as Audin justly terms them) who fattened on her spoils and proved themselves serpents ever ready to assail her. It was only to recover the patrimony of the Holy See that Cæsar fought, who having discovered that he had a better vocation to defend the Church by arms than by devotion, had become her soldier, and in a lawful war acted, as the Abbé Corry in his life of Alexander says "*selon les règles de la guerre*," an expression which Dr. Madden quotes with reprobation, without touching on the main question whether the war were lawful, which of course the Abbe assumes or shows, but the negative of which Dr. Madden assumes and does *not* show, namely, that it was unlawful. Does he mean to say that it was unlawful to recover the territories of the Church by force of arms from her felon feudatories? or that if it were lawful or not, it was unlawful to proceed according to the rules of war? Is it not monstrous to cast all the odium of the exigencies or incidents of a struggle for life and death between the defenders of the Holy See and its spoliators on the defenders, and represent them as the assailants and the spoliators as the victims and sufferers? And is it decent in a Catholic writer, carefully suppressing all the atrocities of these plunderers of the Church, to narrate (in the language of writers who were in their pay) all the acts of hostility against them as acts of unmitigated and inexcusable atrocity? Is this the way candid Catholics should write history, when it touches the character of those who have worn the purple or held St. Peter's keys? Truly of such it may be said, "you are the descendants of those who killed the prophets: for they slew them and ye dig their

graves." The Colonnas plundered the Church, and the candid Catholics enshrine them.

The chief charge against Cæsar Borgia is that of the murder of his brother, the Duke of Gandia, a charge which has all the most atrocious characteristics of calumny, in that it is made not only in the absence of any atom of evidence to excuse it, but is supported by surmises the most malignant that ever were invented by the human mind. The remarks of the Protestant Roscoe on this subject are so sensible as should put to shame many candid Catholics who, in their insane eagerness to cast odium on the families of any they have been accustomed to abuse as "bad popes," have swallowed with blind credulity the irrational and diabolical hypotheses on which the cruel calumniators of the Borgias have sought to sustain their monstrous charge by others still more monstrous:—"The perpetration of this crime has been imputed by the Italian historians without hesitation to Cæsar, who being disgusted with his ecclesiastical profession and desirous of signaling himself in a military capacity, is supposed to have been jealous of the Duke. It might, (says Roscoe,) be observed that the destination of the elder brother to a secular employment did not necessarily confine the younger to an ecclesiastical state, and that the honour bestowed on the Duke did not prevent the Pontiff from promoting the interests of his second son, whom he had placed in such a station as to afford him an opportunity of obtaining the highest dignity in Christendom. Some authors, therefore, (continues the historian) have not scrupled to suggest a more powerful cause of the supposed enmity." Let the reader remark the *therefore*; that is to say, because they were resolved to make a malignant charge for which there was no evidence, and had to suggest a motive to give the least plausibility to the charge, and the one they first suggested was too absurd to bear a moment's examination—therefore, they did not scruple (ah no! no scruple influences those cruel calumniators) to suggest a more powerful cause of the supposed enmity: what that was we need not enter into more particularly; enough to say that it relates to Lucretia, and has amply been disposed of by Roscoe himself.

"Frequently, however, as this charge has been repeated, and indiscriminately as it has been believed, it might not be difficult to show that so far from this being with justice

admitted as a proof that Cæsar Borgia was the perpetrator of the murder of his brother, the imputation is in itself in the highest degree improbable, and the transaction must therefore be judged by such positive evidence as yet remains, without presuming the guilt of Borgia from circumstances which are yet more questionable than the crime of which he stands accused.” Roscoe takes the most particular account of the transaction as given by Burchardt, (the account which is quoted by Dr. Madden), and what does it amount to? In effect to this, that for a month before the fatal night an unknown person in a mask had visited him daily; that after supping with his mother, in company with Cæsar his brother, they proceeded from her house together for some distance, when the Duke parted from the Cardinal, (informing him that he had to pay a visit,) and dismissing all his servants but the masked person and a footman, went away. At a certain spot he left his servant, and proceeded alone with the masked person, being the last time he was seen alive, save by his murderers. Within a short time he must have been murdered, and it must have been in the company of the masked person, who does not appear ever to have been discovered. Now, such being the facts, and remembering moreover the dreadful state of Rome during the pontificates of Sixtus and Alexander, owing to the turbulent conduct of the nobility, who, in the absence of the Popes from Rome, had become lawless and reckless in the last degree; recollecting also that the Borgias had bitter enemies, and enemies well capable of the crime of assassination, a crime so common in Rome that upwards of two hundred instances of it occurred in a short period of that era; remembering these circumstances, one should have thought that the most obvious and probable supposition would have been adopted—that an enemy had done this. But alas! no, there is malignity more fell than that of the murderer, and this malignity prompted some of those who hated the family to strive to inflict upon it a deadlier wound than the assassin’s, and brand it with the awful guilt of fratricide. Nothing but the most malignant enmity could have devised so fiend-like an accusation—for all the facts absolutely, utterly negative it, and make it palpably false, flagrantly impossible. The Duke parts from the Cardinal and proceeds in a different direction with his own servant: parts from him, and proceeds alone with a mysterious and

masked stranger, as to whom nothing is known. Throughout the whole narrative, says the intelligent historian, there is not the slightest indication that Cæsar had any share in the transaction, and the continuance of the favour of his father and mother after the event may prove to every impartial mind that he was not even suspected by them as the author of the crime." Such is the calm, deliberate judgment of an eminently calm and dispassionate mind—the mind of a Protestant—as to this, the chief charge against Cæsar Borgia: a charge indeed comprising a combination of charges of the most horrible, diabolical and unnatural criminality. The learned Roscoe is of opinion that these accusations against the Borgias are false; and confessedly there is not the shadow of actual evidence, however remote or circumstantial, against them. All rests on bare surmise, without an excuse even for suspicion, the mere invention of a murderous hate. Strange that calumnies discredited by Protestant historians should be greedily received by Catholics, and that the children of the Papacy should gather up to assail it with accusations which its opponents despise!

The other of the accusations against Cæsar, and indirectly against Alexander, who is represented as sanctioning the crimes of his son, is the execution of the conspirators of Sinigaglia—men who had combined to destroy him. This we have already disposed of.

A more striking instance is that of Alexander's daughter, Lucretia. Every one knows the horrible accusations by which she has been assailed, and we hope every one knows how admirably she has been vindicated by the learned labours of Roscoe. "The historians of Ferrara mention her with the highest praise. Her marriage with Alfonso of Este was celebrated in a Latin epithalamium by Ariosto; and if the moral character of the bride had been so notoriously disgraceful as to render her an object of abhorrence, it is scarcely to be supposed that Ariosto would have had the effrontery or the absurdity to represent her as rivalling in the decorum of her manners as well as in the beauty of her person all that former times could boast." In the forty-second book of his immortal poem he has raised a temple of female excellence, the splendid niches of which are occupied by women of the greatest merit and chief distinction in Italy, and among them Lucretia Borgia assumes the first and most conspicuous station. The

celebrated printer, Aldo Manuzio, tells her that her chief desire is to stand approved by God and to be useful not only to the present age but to future times, so that when you quit this life you may leave behind you a monument that you have not lived in vain, and he commends in the warmest terms her piety, her liberality, and her justice. Now as the assailants of Alexander associate his iniquity especially with that of his daughter, her vindication is in a great measure his own: the more so if we consider that she was undoubtedly the object of his most anxious affection, (which he evinced in the most truly paternal way in carefully attending to her happiness in her matrimonial unions), and the fair and ordinary presumption is, that a daughter undoubtedly sometimes owed in some degree her virtue to his care. Thus then the demoniacal malice of his slanderers recoils upon themselves and helps to refute their diabolical accusations. That affection for her, which with fiend-like malignity they distort into a crime, is by her admirable character, as testified by the noblest writers of the age, converted into his most victorious vindication.

On what perilous ground a Catholic author is when he ventures rashly to assail the character of a Pontiff, one or two passages from the concluding portions of Dr. Madden's work will sadly illustrate. "It is the fact (he says) that Alexander committed no act against the faith, and promulgated no decree in contravention of doctrines duly sanctioned by the Church in its councils." These last words seem to imply an unconsciousness that the decrees of Popes, *ex cathedra*, declare doctrines "duly sanctioned by the Church," whether or not sanctioned by any of its councils. In the next page, however, he says: "If Alexander never promulgated any doctrine as an article of faith that was not orthodox, it cannot be said that he never issued any bull, ordinance, or rescript whose decisions were at variance with the eternal principles of justice, truth, and morality." The writer evidently thinks that Popes—even Popes who decree nothing contrary to the faith—may nevertheless issue decrees or briefs "at variance with justice, truth, and morality." There is a more than questionable character in this: and the passage reveals a confusion of ideas which renders it obscure: nor is the obscurity diminished by the gross inconsistency of the very next sentence with that which went before. "The whole pontifical career" (i.e. his acts as Pontiff, or at least while

Pontiff) "of Alexander was one unbroken succession of outrages against all those principles. It was in practice a downright disregard of Christianity: a mad, reckless infidelity: an atheism manifested not in words but acts, supervening on unbridled lust, rapacity, and ambition." There is an incoherent extravagance in this shocking sentence which makes it difficult to dissect it. But if it have any meaning it means this—that a Pontiff who does not act against the faith may act all through the whole of his pontifical career with downright disregard of Christianity. The "whole of his pontifical career" must at least, and one should suppose peculiarly if not exclusively, include his acts as Pontiff; and how a Pontiff who never committed any act against the faith could always act with disregard of Christianity is hard to understand.

It is obvious that this is reckless raving. We will show that it is so out of the writer's own words in the next page. He is obliged to admit what we have all along been arguing,—“That the political enmity of so many adversaries has caused his crimes against one virtue in particular, (he evidently means the virtue of chastity), from the time of his elevation to the pontificate, to be exaggerated.” He adds,—and let the reader mark—“There is no conclusive evidence to be found in the history of his times, of his having flagrantly violated his vows of chastity during the period of his pontificate.” Passing over the peculiar sophistry which seems to insinuate that a Pontiff may violate his vows of chastity without flagrantly violating them; and the unfairness of suggesting that there is any evidence of Alexander's having done so flagrantly or not during the period of his pontificate, when it must be known to Dr. Madden there is none at all—passing this by, the admission of Dr. Madden is enough to convict him of great rashness in so recklessly charging Alexander VI., the Pope, with “unbridled lust,”—when on his own confession there is no conclusive evidence of his having ever once violated his vows of chastity after he ascended the apostolical throne. We go farther, and we say that, seeing that the assailants of Alexander make his lust while Pope one of their chief charges, and on the confession of one of his most determined assailants, that it is a foul calumny; this should have suggested to the mind of any Catholic writer a charitable suspicion that the other accusations against this much maligned pontiff were

equally false, and prevented a wholesale and reckless repetition of them in language the most inflamed and most enveloped. But this is not all; no, nor nearly all. What will the reader say when he is assured that the admission which Dr. Madden so reluctantly makes as to the chastity of Alexander during his pontificate, might and ought equally to be made as to his prelacy and cardinalate? It is so. For there is not an atom of credible evidence that Alexander, after entering the Church, carried on any impure connection; and there are strong reasons to suppose the reverse. One reason is, that it would have been almost impossible for a person of such distinction, and with such remorseless foes, to have carried on a criminal intercourse without facts transpiring which would have been trumpeted forth with triumph instead of vague, general abuse. Another, and a stronger reason is this, that, whereas the chief charge against him is his care for his natural children, (a queer kind of charge,—for surely if it were a crime to have them, it were a virtue to take care of them,) and yet we never heard of any younger than Cæsar and Lucretia; and there is, as Dr. Madden admits, great doubt whether they were sister and brother, which, of itself raises a fair question whether there were not truth in the representation of Alexander that Cæsar was not his son at all, but the legitimate son of the widow with whom in early life he had lived. Anyhow, if he had ever since their birth been living in a criminal state, it is not easily accountable that no children are heard of at all after that time than they, and they were born when he was not a priest at all, but a soldier; and a soldier, in an age certainly as corrupt as any that had passed away. All the coarse calumnies about the unbridled lust of Alexander, therefore, come to this, that some twenty years before he was Pope—before he was a priest—while he was a gay and gallant soldier, he had lived in sin. Why the same might probably be said of St. Ignatius, and probably would have been said had he been Pope in the age of Alexander. Really and truly, when the evidence is looked to, this is all that it comes to. There are heaps of obscene assertions by writers in the interest of his foes, but of credible evidence there is none to any greater extent than what we have stated.

In addition to the discredit thrown upon all the accusations of Alexander by the established falsehood of the

worst charges against him and others of his family, there is a powerful argument in his favour derivable from the flagrant inconsistency of these accusations with the tenor and character of his private life, as described even by his enemies. "Even by his severest adversaries," says Roscoe, "he is allowed to have been a man of an elevated genius and wonderful memory ;" qualities not very commonly found united with brutal debauchery and horrible lust ; but mark what follows : "In his diet he was peculiarly temperate, and he accustomed himself to but little sleep." We appeal to every observer of human nature whether these are the characteristics of a mind and body enervated by impurity or degraded by debauchery. Dr. Madden indeed admits that during his papacy Alexander did not flagrantly (which we presume means not at all), violate his vows of chastity, but the point to be observed is, that all those historians who malign his memory and revile his name, declare that he did ; and that he lived a life not only of lust, but of lust abominable and horrible. Now, if writers most hostile to him, not only writers so impartial as Voltaire, Bayle, or Roscoe, pronounce these accusations to be horrid calumnies ; and if authors so avowedly hostile as Dr. Madden, declare them to be false, and to be unsupported by any evidence, what are we to think of the fiend-like malignity of the writers whose foul minds invented and fabricated these fictions of crime ; and how can we hesitate to discard as unworthy of credit all the other accusations resting on such infamous testimony ? This is the course taken in courts of justice when witnesses are convicted of wicked falsehood. It is the just and fair course, and if not taken in respect to the bad Popes, it is only because the wish to make them bad, is first father to the thought, and then the will clings to the thought too tenaciously to yield to any touch of charity or force of truth. It is a collateral but not immaterial confirmation of our opinion as to the real character of Alexander, that he should have been selected by the kings of Spain and Portugal as the arbiter of their disputes, respecting the boundary of their newly discovered territories in America, especially, as Gosselin informs us, that the selection of Alexander VI. by the two sovereigns as umpire of their disputes, was founded principally on the respect which both professed for the sacred character of the Pope, so that as he expressly states in his Bull upon the question that his

arbitration was at their voluntary selection,—it is clear that in his person the Apostolical authority had sustained no injury. Could this be consistent with political depravity? Where could we find clearer evidence of calumny?

Take the death of Alexander as narrated by Guicciardini. Nothing can be compared to it for malignity and mendacity except part of Shakspeare's account of the death of Cardinal Beaufort. The Pope is represented as having been poisoned with a fatal draught, prepared by his son Cæsar, for a common enemy. Now, as the murder is said to have occurred at the house of that enemy, or alleged enemy, it might have suggested itself to any unprejudiced person that possibly the enemy had administered the poison: and candid Catholics always carefully keep out of view the fact that the foes of the Popes used poison and poniards. But passing these points over it is perfectly plain that the Pope did not die of poison at all, and that the whole of the elaborate account of the Italian historian is emphatically and literally *a lie*. Burchardt, the papal master of the ceremonies, in his diary, gives a detailed narrative of the illness of Alexander, which terminated in his death—there not being a word as to poison. Voltaire says most truly, and surely a more impartial or acute authority could not be quoted: “Europe is deceived by Guicciardini, as he was by his passion; he hated the Pope, and by his hate judged the Pope's actions; there is not a vestige of proof of this accusation against his memory.” Rohrbacher writes in similar terms. And even Dr. Madden is compelled to say: “no sufficient evidence of the fact stated by Guicciardini has ever been adduced.” We might ask how Dr. Madden reconciled it with his conscience as a Catholic, to give renewed currency to such an atrocious fabrication, with this faint and hesitating intimation of doubt. Let that pass. Clearly the whole narrative of Guicciardini is an elaborate lie. The important question surely suggests itself; how can we rely on other similar statements of such a mendacious historian? Strange to say, it does not occur to Dr. Madden, to ask a single question, still less to answer it; but he unscrupulously cites all the atrocious statements of this lying writer, so far as they assail the character of Alexander.

It was all very well for these writers to revile a Pontiff who sought to add to the dominions of the Holy See by

arms, instead of affording the example of a well-regulated life. No doubt the princes who patronized them, the plunderers of the Church would prefer Pontiffs of a more peaceful and ascetic character, who submitted patiently to have the possessions of the Holy See torn from them, and surrendered to ruthless wretches who thought nothing of cutting off men's hands and feet, or burning or flaying those who offended them. But there is, as Scripture says, a time for all things, even for fighting, and when a prince, (for the pope is prince as well as a pontiff,) finds his subjects tortured and plundered by ruthless usurpers, surely fighting may be a duty. That it was a duty undertaken by Pontiffs not always from warlike propensities, but from a sense of justice, is evident from the instance of the successor of Julius, the peaceful and humane Leo de Medici, who, before his own elevation to the Popedom, went into the field with the Papal army, and was indefatigable in exhorting them to contend with courage for the perfection of the Holy See, and the liberties of Italy. And Roscoe describes the objects which these Pontiffs had in view; and which Ranke justly calls "magnanimous," as being to recover the possessions of the Holy See, and to restore Italy to the dominion of its native princes. The fact is, Italy had become the prey of spoilers, and for the patrimony of the Holy See the wild boar had devoured it; remedy for so disordered a state of things could not be but sharp; the boar could only be driven out by the sword; the lamb could not be rescued only by the shepherd's crook. A race of spoliators and oppressors, of felon chieftains and bandit barons, could not be extirpated by sermons; it was a time for sterner measures; and it is namby-pamby philosophy, and mawkish theology, which affects to be scandalized at a Pontiff and a prince resisting with the sword those who seek to slay with the sword, defending his own subjects from cruel tyranny, and repulsing those who sacrilegiously preyed upon the patrimony of the Church, and oppressed it with brutal barbarism, and deluged it in blood!

A clear light is thrown upon the real cause and character of the accusations against Alexander, by the nature of those which are levelled at his successor, Julius II. Of him Roscoe truly says, that in suppressing the vicars of the Church, and uniting their territories to the Holy See—a curious instance this of the destroying influence of

prejudice, even on a superior mind, for the very term vicars, implies that they were delegates of the Papacy, and that their territories were not theirs, but those of the Church—“ he completed what Alexander had begun,” or rather which Sixtus had begun and Alexander continued. “ The Italian historians, however, have not shown themselves favourable to his fame, and Guicciardini asserts, that if he be considered as a great man, it is only by those who have forgotten the right meaning of words, and conceive it rather the office of a Pontiff to add to the dominion of the apostolic see by Christian arms and Christian blood, than to afford the example of a well-regulated life ;” an observation breathing the spirit of hypocrisy, which characterizes the secular historians of the age in speaking of the Papacy, and which may be compared with a similar observation of Villani, made with reference to these very “ vicars” of the Holy See when originally established. Muratori goes further than Guicciardini in malignity of calumny, for he charges Julius with meditating the murder of the Duke d’Este, an accusation which the discriminating Roscoe discards as utterly groundless. The fact is, it will marvellously aid us in estimating at their true value these accusations, to consider who were the authors. Thus Guicciardini was a Florentine, citizen of a state often at enmity with the Holy See, by reason of its own restless aggressiveness. And Muratori was a partizan of the House of Este. Suffice it on this subject to say here, that it is plain to any impartial mind—as illustrated alike in the instances of Sixtus, Alexander, and Julius—that Popes who defended the temporal possessions of the Holy See, were exposed to the malignant enmity of the princes who seized them, and the calumnies of the writers they patronized.

The manner in which even historians so enlightened as Roscoe speak of Pontiffs so eminent as Leo X., especially on the subject of their temporal possessions of the Holy See, very much illustrates our views with respect to those whom we have referred to as the so-called bad Popes. We have seen that these Pontiffs became objects of hostility and calumny chiefly on account of their ability in resisting aggressions on the Church, and their efforts to restore her patrimony. Leo X. has never been classed even by enemies of the Papacy with those whose names are blackened as the “ bad Popes,” but still he is considered by

candid Catholics and enlightened Protestants as by no means coming up to their exalted ideal of perfection, because he was not sufficiently ascetic, and was worldly-minded enough to lose no opportunity of recovering any part of the Papal territories. It was for this that Sixtus, Alexander, and Julius, were reviled, and for this Leo did not escape calumny. In his time, however, the Church was beginning to reap the fruit of the labours of former Pontiffs, and on the impartial authority of Roscoe we can affirm that Italy was rendered more tranquil by the extension of the power of the Church, and the recovery of her patrimony. How could it be otherwise, when we contrast the peace and prosperity of the states under the benign sway of the Holy See, with the painful condition of those who groaned under the brutal domination of those bandits, the Italian barons? When speaking of the endeavours of Leo to recover the territory of Perugia, Roscoe writes in these terms:—

“For some years he had turned his attention towards the smaller states in the vicinity of the Roman territory, which had been seized upon by successful adventurers, or were occupied by domestic tyrants, but over which the Church had always asserted her superiority whenever an opportunity occurred of enforcing its claims.” And why not? “The city of Perugia was governed by Gian-Paolo-Baglioni, who, if we may believe contemporary historians, was a monster of iniquity and impiety; but the cruelty with which he exercised his usurped authority, rendered him no less an object of dread than his other crimes did of horror.” And when Leo had got hold of this monster, he was forced to confess crimes which the historian says a “thousand deaths would not have expiated.” So here we find part of the territory of the Church usurped by a “monster of iniquity.” Was not the Supreme Pontiff justified in liberating his own subjects from the thralldom of such a “monster?” Yet with the characteristic inconsistency of a Protestant historian, when writing of the Papacy, Roscoe proceeds thus:—“From similar motives, and under similar pretexts,” (as if in the former instance the motive was a mere matter of pretext,) “Leo attacked Ferino, then held by Frederici.” But he goes on to say that “the fall of Frederici intimidated the petty tyrants who had possessed themselves of cities or fortresses in the march of Ancona,” and that those of them who had com-

mitted the greatest enormities were executed. So we collect that in the opinion of a Protestant historian it is a mere pretext for a Supreme Pontiff to deliver his own territories from the yoke of tyrants, who commit the greatest enormities. In a similar spirit Roscoe speaks of the alliance which Leo formed with the Emperor, who had hereditary claims on Italy, to expel the French, who were only unrighteous invaders. "The government of the French," we are informed, "had given great dissatisfaction, insomuch that many of the noble and principal inhabitants had quitted the city, and taken refuge in different parts of Italy." The Emperor was to restore Parma and Piacenza to the Holy See, the rightful owners of those territories, and whose sway its subjects were able to appreciate, for Roscoe says that the "inhabitants expressed the greatest satisfaction on being restored to the dominion of the Church." Yet he insinuates it was culpable on the part of the Pontiff to have entered into an alliance with the view of recovering his own territories from a tyranny so galling, that it drove the inhabitants from their homes, and made them hail their restoration to the Holy See with joy. And he is awfully scandalized at the cardinal legates of the Church marching in the midst of the papal army, "preceded by their silver crosses," to the great degradation of their religion and office. Why so? Where could cardinal legates be better employed than in lending the high sanction of "their religion and office" to a "holy war," for the recovery of the patrimony of the Church from the oppression of a grinding tyranny? And where could the Cross be more fitly exhibited than as the symbol of the extension, or rather the restoration of its benign sway? That the sway of the Church was benign and mild, even Protestant historians, and the traditions and maxims of the middle ages amply attest. In that most valuable work of Gosselin, which the excellent translation of one of the Professors of Maynooth has recently placed before English readers, there are admirable observations as to the view which ought to be taken of the position of the Popes in the middle ages. And there is one passage in particular to which we crave attention: after alluding to the candid opinions of some able Protestant writers on the subject, the author observes, "The language of these Protestants is certainly a keen reproach to a great number of Catholic writers, who can never touch

on any of these delicate questions without introducing reflections most injurious to the Holy See and the Catholic Church.” Referring especially to Leibnitz, he says: “The respect with which this great man, though a Protestant, has always spoken of the Popes, and his anxiety to exculpate them, are a lesson to some Catholics, who, pursuing a directly opposite course, labour to exaggerate all that is objectionable in the conduct or measures of the Popes; and who violate in this matter all the rules of decency and moderation.” Most earnestly we commend these just, excellent, and stringent observations to “candid” Catholics, who in future may be tempted to circulate rash strictures upon so called “bad Popes.”

But now we must beg the best attention of our readers to some remarkable observations of Roscoe, on the character of Leo X., which have an equal application to other pontiffs of whom we have spoken, and illustrate the views we have conveyed. Every word applies as well to Sixtus, Alexander, or Julius, as to Leo. “From the time of his pontificate to the present day, numerous causes have concurred in giving rise to erroneous opinions and violent prejudices respecting him, into which it may be necessary to institute dispassionate inquiry. That distinguished excellence or even superior rank and elevation is certainly attended by envy and detraction has been the standing remark of all ages, but independently of this common ground of attack, Leo was from various circumstances the peculiar object of censure and abuse. This liability to misrepresentation commenced with his birth, which occurred in the bosom of a city at all times agitated with internal commotions, and where the preeminent station which his family had long occupied, rendered its members obnoxious to the attacks and reproaches of their political opponents. Hence almost all contemporary historians may be considered as partisans either warmly attached or decidedly adverse to him: a circumstance highly unfavourable to the impartiality of historical truth. Another source of the great diversity of opinion respecting this Pontiff is to be traced to the high office which he filled, and to the manner in which he conducted himself in the political concerns of his times.” Let the reader remark what follows. “As many of the Italian potentates during the wars which desolated Italy attached themselves to the cause of foreign powers, in like manner several of the Italian historians

have espoused in their writings the interests of other nations, and have hence been led to regard the conduct of Leo with an unfavourable eye, as the result of a restless and ambitious disposition. This indifference to the independence and common cause of Italy is observable even in the greatest of Italian historians, and has led Guicciardini unjustly to deprecate, rather than duly to estimate the merits of the pontiff. The same dereliction of national and patriotic spirit is yet more apparent in Muratori; who has frequently written with too great a partiality to the cause of the French monarchy; a partiality which is perhaps to be ascribed to the close alliance which subsisted between them, and the ancestors of his great patrons, the family of Este. It may be further observed, that Leo frequently exerted his authority, and even employed his arms against the inferior potentates of Italy (the tyrants of whom he had been writing, as guilty of crimes too great to be expiated by a thousand deaths,) “some of whom severely felt the weight of his resentment:” having been justly executed for the greatest enormities, and that these princes have had their annalists and panegyrists, who have not scrupled on many occasions to sacrifice the reputation of the pontiff to that of their patrons. To these may be added various other causes of offence, as well of a public as a private nature, unavoidably given by the pontiff in the course of his pontificate, and which afforded a plausible opportunity to those whom he had offended, of vilifying his private character, and loading his memory with calumny and abuse.” There is not a word of which could not be equally as well applied to Alexander VI., to Sixtus, or to Julius, or to Leo, and much of it would be far more applicable to them than to him: for they were placed in circumstances far more trying, far more exposed to enmity and envy. It was Sixtus who commenced that movement on the part of the Holy See to recover its patrimony—which was continued by Alexander, carried on by Julius—and completed by Leo. He in a great degree realized the fruit of their labours. He found allies where they had only found foes; he came at a time when the contest was comparatively easy—when the rough work was done—when the assailants of the Church had exhausted much of their hatred, and worked to the utmost the foul weapons of calumny. He encountered only the last efforts of the storm against which they had struggled, in its fullest and

fiercest violence. He consummated the great work, and that it was a good one is proved by the result, the purification of Italy. It is an undoubted fact, that in the Pontificate of Leo, Italy enjoyed a greater degree of prosperity than before the Papal territories had been restored.

The character ascribed to Leo may, in a great degree, be attributed to Alexander. For Paolo speaks of his fondness for literature, his patronage of art, his wonderful sagacity, and his humanity. If in this latter quality any should suppose it absurd to imagine that Alexander resembled him, let it be observed that other writers deny it to Leo; and as we have seen, the received motives for calumny which existed in one case, existed to a greater extent in the other. The historian of the Council of Trent says of Leo, "He would have been a *perfect* pontiff if to other accomplishments he had united some knowledge in matters of religion, and a greater inclination to piety: to neither of which he appeared to pay any great attention." Even if this were so, it would be only proving that Leo was not a *perfect* pontiff, which we are far from affirming, either of him or of Alexander; but it is very far short of showing either of them to have been a bad Pope: and Fra Paolo proceeds to say, "scandal always delights to affix her spots on the brightest characters," and that the attention which Leo paid to amusements was in part attributable to the manners of the age, his high rank, and his natural disposition, and describes it justly as an imperfection (although not a trifling one) in the pontiff's character. But other Italian historians give a far better character to Leo, and a contemporary states that he diligently sought out men who had signalized themselves, *especially in theology*, which refutes the slander of Fra Paolo Sarpi, that he paid no attention to religion. And this would of itself be sufficient to show how little we can rely on the statements disparaging or disgraceful to the characters of the Popes; how likely they are to be lying inventions, arising out of some of those numberless bad motives which lead men to calumny. Even Erasmus eulogizes Leo for three great blessings bestowed upon mankind—of which one was the *restoration of Christian piety*. And this was the Pontiff who utterly neglected religion! Verily it is enough to make one exclaim with the Psalmist, "I have said in my heart all men are liars!" Unquestionably all men are so who "speak

evil of dignities ;” for the more the truth is enquired into, the more will it be found that if there is ever any truth in what they say, it is certain to be largely mixed with falsehood. Happily Leo had an Erasmus to vindicate his character by his unimpeachable testimony. Some pontiffs equally calumniated, have been less fortunate in their fame, and have had no contemporary champions, and have been thrown on the charity of posthumous vindicators.

This was the case with Alexander, with Julius, and with Sixtus. And of these not all have found defenders even among posterity. We believe that to no nobler task can the intellect of a Catholic be directed, than in the vindication of these victims of the malignity of calumny. It is not necessary to make them out perfect ; enough, to prove them not to have been wicked. It is not necessary to show them saints ; sufficient to remove scandal. Happy have we been to labour, however humbly, in so sacred a cause : in vindicating the character of the Vicars of Christ. If we shall have removed one stone of that mountain of scandal which slander has heaped upon their memories, we shall not deem our labour lost ; partly because it may serve to stimulate others to bring finer faculties to the noble task. And although we should be well content to rescue the maligned Pontiffs from the imputation of vice, we do not desire to confine their champions to that limited issue, nor despair of their characters receiving a far more complete vindication. We know that it is not the bad, but the good who are the victims of calumny ; and that as it is only the wicked who calumniate, it is only the virtuous who are calumniated ; and that in the teaching of our Divine Lord it is not praise but slander which is the test of sanctity. Knowing this, we consider that to prove these Pontiffs calumniated, is a great step toward showing them to have been good : and therefore do not despair of the bad popes turning out after all the best. What has been done for Gregory VII., or Innocent VIII., may yet be done for a Sixtus IV., or a Julius II. : aye even for an Alexander VI., and we have done something by general reasoning, or isolated illustrations, to establish if not the probability, at least the possibility, that to some future writer may be reserved the nobler triumph over calumny, the bringing out in light and truth the blackened characters of all the calumniated Pontiffs who are held up to execration as the bad popes.

ART. II.—*Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain.* By AGNES STRICKLAND, Author of “*Lives of Queens of England.*” Blackwood and Son, Edinburgh and London. 1854.

“**I**CI ils commencent par faire tuer un homme, et puis on lui fait son procès.” The precedent that so alarmed M. de Porcchaugnac is followed more frequently and more closely in every country than people at all suppose, and the posthumous justice administered by history is to the full as halting, as contentious, and as unreal as any process complained of in our own day. The infallible judgment of history, and its assured reversal of cotemporary injustice, is one of the hollowest, and precisely for that reason not least sonorous clap-traps, that ever deluded an enthusiast or heated even a cool head like that of Bacon, when he said he appealed from the judgment of the hour to foreign countries and posterity. All the fine things that Cicero has said of history—and they are very fine—apply, unfortunately, not to history as it is, but to history as it might be. They are true of a mere abstraction, and may be affirmed of history as certain qualities may undoubtedly be predicated of centaurs and hippogriffs.

It is not pretended, of course, that this should be taken literally, but what we mean to convey is, that for the bulk of men, in these countries at least, no authentic or faithful history exists. Thousands will read the “*Child’s History of England*,” not so useful a production by half as the “*Child’s Own Book*,” for one that masters Lingard; while Pinnock’s *Goldsmith*, not to speak of Hume and Smollet, will keep up the Protestant tradition in ten thousand schools, whose scholars will never dream of looking for anything more safe or correct. Some fair-minded men of all parties will profit by the labours of any faithful investigator, and range themselves on whatever side they are attracted to by the weight of evidence and light of demonstration; but the mass, even of the learned, will carefully guard the deposit of fiction that has come down to them, and even should the controversy divide them into camps,

the world at large will swear by Goldsmith, believe in the cruelty of Mary and virtue of Elizabeth, inevitably associate popery with slavery and wooden shoes, and cling with unshaken devotedness to the other truths of the glorious Reformation.

The history of Mary Queen of Scots sadly illustrates what we have been saying. It is conceded by those who view her character least favourably, that none of the proceedings by which it was attempted to colour her deposition or death, were in any respect trials, whether as regards the competency of the jurisdiction, the character of the judges, or the machinery of the investigation. But if Mary had no trial for her own benefit before death, her subsequent trial has lasted for the benefit of posterity well nigh three centuries, and is likely to last as many more; though not very long since everything seemed to promise the exhaustion of the enquiry. The discoveries of successive explorers have been scrutinized by careful and candid, as well as jealous and hostile criticism. Miss Strickland's Life of Mary Stuart is the work of an undisguised admirer, and we are bound to add not unsuccessful apologist of that unfortunate princess. M. Mignet, whose work upon the same controversy we noticed in a former number of this Journal, is very frequently at issue with our authoress, as might be anticipated from the general difference of their views, and she is by no means hesitating in her opinion of his merits. For our own part, it is the result of our experience, such as it is, that a claim set up by any man to a perfectly balanced judgment and entire freedom from prejudice, raises a vehement presumption that his judgment is far weaker than his self-esteem. M. Mignet in his *preface*, it will be admitted, reaches that commanding eminence from which all party and religious predilections diminish and fade, but once out of the preface he finds his level. His miracle resembles that of Simon Magus; he has strength to jerk himself into the air, but at a certain height his gods desert him, and he drops. But Miss Strickland, though she makes slight, we should rather say, no pretensions to impartiality, is by no means dogmatical, and seldom speaks without at least some degree of warrant for what she advances. Rather more chatty and familiar than quite beseems an historian, she is not at all trifling or sketchy, and very few writers satisfy you more completely of the soundness of her

views, when they are sound, than Miss Strickland. This is owing most probably to the absence of affectation, whether of earnestness or candour, and the consequent conviction left upon your mind that all she allows you to see of herself, or the subject of her biography, is genuine. That some of her views should be erroneous, is of course inevitable, and that some inferences should be strained, is as little surprising, but it is not to be denied that there is scarce one of the principal controversies in connection with the name of Mary Stuart on which she has not thrown some light, and amassed considerable materials for judgment, investigating evidence and collecting proofs with great ingenuity and great fairness, qualities that often have been thought to exclude each other.

Nor should we be justified in overlooking the obstacles by which the subject is cumbered at every step. The difficulty of appreciating the character of Mary with perfect calmness, has been felt and admitted by most who are at all conversant with her history and the history of her times—

“Who can be wise, amazed, temperate, furious,
Loyal, and neutral, in a moment?”

We have to bear in mind, or else to put aside, the peculiar circumstances of her sex and education, the people amongst whom she was reared, and those whom she was born to govern, the storms she had to buffet, and the reeds on which she had to lean—we must be on our guard against the fascination she threw over so many, and equally upon our guard against the dishonesty of her enemies, being bound withal to avoid the danger that may result from that affectation of impassability which has often turned aside the honest and well-intentioned from their obvious duty through fear of being supposed to favour what might be considered their own side of a question, or that to which their tastes and principles might be thought to incline them.

In the history of Mary, nearly all the sources of information were at one time tainted, or at least doubtful. It was strictly a case of circumstantial evidence, and is so to a certain extent even yet; so that friends and foes were obliged to resort largely to conjecture and special pleading, in the absence of any more substantial materials. That

state of things however, has been greatly altered by the labours of Tytler, Labanoff, and (we may be permitted to add) of our authoress. We have already in the notice of M. Mignet's work which appeared in No. LXIII, entered somewhat at large upon the matters in dispute as suggested by his volumes, and perhaps it would be convenient to give a brief resumé of what was attempted in that paper, and it will appear how fully most of our positions are sustained by the subsequent investigations of Miss Strickland, which, though they have not brought to light much that is new, have nevertheless elicited facts and dates of trifling individual importance, but certainly corroborative of more important facts and inferences.

The first consideration that forces itself upon any tolerably honest student of this strange history is the difficulty, perfectly unexampled, we boldly affirm, of Mary's position on her return to Scotland. She reached that country at the age of nineteen, after a probation of twelve or thirteen years in a court supposed to be the most corrupt, as it was, even then, the most refined in Europe. She was recent from an atmosphere the most trying to the soul's health, the most redolent of deadly sweets, the most pernicious to every moral sense and virtuous susceptibility, of any that was known, and she left it after having worn the matrimonial crown without any impeachment of honor, or any corruption of heart. The moment she touched the soil of her native kingdom, instead of duty and homage, she met with stiff knees and stubborn wills; the Church was a prey to Calvin and the Commonwealth to anarchy. She had traitors at her council, traitors in her family,—she was served by traitors at home, and represented by traitors abroad. The chief business of her few friends was not to train her hand to government, to suggest administrative measures, to open the treasures of their hoary experience at her feet, or freshen her policy by the vigour of their young and impetuous genius; it was no business of theirs to aid her in the development of the country's resources, or in resistance to the country's enemies—the utmost they could do was to put her on her guard, to foster continual suspicion, to keep up a perpetual system of checks and counterchecks, to indoctrinate her with dissimulation as the most elementary, as perhaps the only means of self-sustainment, and in their loyalty and truth to destroy the perfection and symmetry of a mind as

delicately and as nobly organized as any that ever adorned a throne or blessed a nation. Let her compose her looks or actions in Holyrood as she might, they were perused and reported by the secret-service-men of England. In her invaded Churches, she was denounced by Knox, and his fellows in the judaised slang of the time; the priest was stoned in her domestic chapel; and the royal progress marked its stages by insults. The factions that tore each other in the court and in the country, were all alike the pensioners of England, and the enemies of their Queen. Her vigour, her mercy, her loftiness, her meekness, her gaiety, her seriousness, her conscientiousness, her toleration were equally odious, and equally unfortunate. Her steps, her glances, her words, were scored and registered. It was every man's study to trip her in her speech and ambush in her path. And thus beset, thus waylaid, thus trapped, thus baited, were she from nineteen to twenty-five to have erred, not indeed so deeply and so grievously as her accusers represented, but still seriously and even fatally, it could not be matter of surprise.

This however, was the habitual and, so to speak, the normal condition of Scotland in her reign. But if we look to the extraordinary miseries of her union with Darnley, that impracticable malignant, that miracle of treason and ingratitude, whom no kindness could propitiate, and no law could bind; who was destined for the slaughter from the first, and confederated with the slaughtermen to degrade and depose her who had made him the partner of her throne; and if, in connection with all these circumstances, we take and draw together the good, the gentle, the womanly, the *queenly* qualities; the firmness, the tact, the moderation, the forbearance, the lovingness of Mary, as instanced by the indisputable facts we find in her historians, and in none more graphically than Miss Strickland; we find it difficult to conceive, even if more positive and peremptory arguments were not at hand, how one so wonderfully endowed could be so vicious and yet so silly, could unite in so uncommon a degree the dupe, the knave, and the blunderer, as Mary is represented to have done.

The inaccuracies of time and place which Miss Strickland detects, and exposes in Mary's adversaries, are nearly all of primary importance, and surprisingly numerous. Even taken by themselves, they have a strong absolute value, as demonstrating the impossibility of many of

the occurrences deposed to by her enemies, having taken place, at least in the way and at the time alleged; but if we couple these positive facts, drawn from documents often hostile, and from records that cannot err, with the antecedent improbability we derive from Mary's well-known tastes and feelings, we have a body of proof sufficiently substantial to support a very decided conviction of Mary's innocence, though not to absolve her from all blame of rashness, favouritism, disregard of warnings, and misplaced reliance upon thrice convicted traitors. What gives the strongest corroboration to Miss Strickland's figures, if they stood in need of any, is the simple explanation of which Mary's acts become susceptible by their aid. And even without the resource of these dates and places, the very acts most inculpated in the Queen will be found in perfect harmony with her character and conduct, at times when suspicion had not pointed at her; so much so, that there is scarce an action of hers in reference to Bothwell, if we except her marriage, that is not in strict conformity with her treatment of and demeanour towards some of her most relentless enemies, and as has been shown by Miss Strickland, nothing more than the relations between Mary and one of her principal ministers could warrant.

As we had occasion to observe in the former essay to which we have alluded, the controversy on this matter has regard to three heads of accusation, under which all the minor charges, grave enough, to be sure, in their nature, easily range themselves. We mean the intimacy of Mary with Rizzio, her imputed complicity in the murder of Darnley, and the participation in the plot for the assassination of Elizabeth, which was the immediate pretext for her death. - On each of these points, as we noticed at the time, the judgment of M. Mignet, if it be not an abuse of the term so to speak, or, at any rate, his impressions, and those he seemed anxious to communicate to his readers, were adverse to the conclusions of those who are disposed to acquit the Queen of Scots. His opinions we found it difficult to reconcile with portions of the evidence, or with the weight of evidence generally. His admission or rejection, we ought rather to say suppression, of evidence, was completely arbitrary and unexplained, circumstances which, if not absolutely badges of bad faith, are hardly consistent with the conscientious care which should be

taken by any one who assumes to enlighten public opinion ; and, as we remarked, no one could fail to be struck by the proof-positive style of his allegations in places where proof was entirely wanting, and the presumption even not very strong. The instances there given of his peculiar manner of treating contested allegations, will hardly have escaped the recollection of those who have followed the enquiry with any degree of interest. His preference for the tattle of Randolph to the researches of Tytler as to Mary's connection with Rizzio ; his reliance on the hostile evidence of her share in the murder of Darnley, without even so much as glancing at the fact that it had been impugned ; and the oracular decisions he did not scruple to pronounce upon such evidence ; the coolness with which he announces that he has established the authenticity of the letters in the famous silver casket ; and the fashion after which he did establish them in the Appendix, by the simple and obvious process of garbling and almost totally suppressing the arguments upon the other side ; were all so open to criticism, that though disposed to notice his work in a not unfriendly spirit, our strictures upon them might be regarded as severe. It would be quite beyond our purpose to travel over the identical line of argument we there followed, or repeat the circumstances which go to impeach the genuineness of those letters on which the whole superstructure of defamation rests—but it gives slender promise of the close of the controversy, when a writer of ability and experience, totally, or nearly so, leaves out of consideration the allegations of one side. It is, in fact, a kind of pleading without traverse, or justification ; it is the reply of an advocate without allusion to the reasoning of his opponent, or of a disputant in syllogistic argument, who impugns his adversary's thesis, without attempting to deny his premises : and the slight retrospect we have allowed ourselves of our former paper by no means encourages us to look for that general and decisive vindication of Mary's character, which ought to result from labours such as those of Miss Strickland. For what hope is there that those who overlook broad facts, and forbear all mention of serious and undecided questions, to say the least, will condescend to small rectifications of dates or minute topographical dissertations ; on which, nevertheless, questions of the gravest import will depend, whilever truth is simple, and liars have need of good

memory? And if this was the case with M. Mignet, who, notwithstanding his avowed admiration of his own religious system, identical with that of Knox, claims to be an impartial arbitrator between the conflict of opinions, in virtue of adopting one set and drawing his pen through the other; how will it fare with us in these countries, where none but a few privileged and highly-endowed spirits can escape from a charmed circle, and a very contracted one, of traditional prejudices? M. Mignet, as we observed, notwithstanding the scant justice he allowed to Mary, did ample justice to the vulgar cruelty of Elizabeth; but what was Mary to expect from those who canonize her executioner? Persons of that class will believe undoubtingly with M. Mignet, that the affirmation of the Scottish privy council is a sufficient voucher for the authenticity of those letters; on the presumption, no doubt, that the council-chamber had some inherent efficacy to work loyalty in traitors, simplicity in intriguers, truth in suborners, ruth in assassins, and generally to change individual scoundrelism into an aggregate of honesty, just as pious Catholics believe a Pope, however weak in government, infallible in cathedrâ. The same robust faith will teach the great majority to concur with M. Mignet in believing the letters more fully authenticated still, by the verdict of the English commission, after a private examination by themselves, and after inspection of the alleged originals, denied to the unfortunate accused; and it is hardly to be doubted they will be easily led to acknowledge that torture, however the question of expediency may turn now, was a likely way of eliciting the truth at the time, and that depositions so obtained are to be admitted without question. On minds of this stamp anything like argument is lost, and unfortunately they are the more numerous, for a time at least.

Under this conviction we should have less hope of a good result from the investigations of almost any other author, how meritorious or learned soever, than of Miss Strickland. She has established for herself an honourable character of sincerity and independence, that is of the utmost advantage to her client, as we must look upon Queen Mary. In her pages will be found abundant matter confirmatory of our own views, but having developed some of these rather at length, or at such length as we could afford already, it might be more desirable to take

a glance at Miss Strickland's manner of dealing with those to which we gave less prominence at the moment, but the elucidation of which cannot fail to influence in a very great degree the main questions to which they are referable.

The imputation first in order, of those sought to be fastened upon Mary Stuart is, that her connection with Rizzio was of a nature to alarm the reasonable susceptibilities of her husband, and farther to *justify* that alarm. It is not to be denied that her relations with her secretary might have been, and naturally, nay, inevitably, were offensive to the political antipathies of her subjects; and it will readily be conceded that they were not such as prudence or circumspection would warrant; but no one who has read, we will not say, Miss Strickland's account, but who has had access to the documents which she, in common with others, have consulted; will fail to reach the conclusion that the charge of any impropriety in the Queen's intercourse with her secretary is entirely unsupported, and not even constructed with ordinary skill. The deformity of the ill-favoured little vocalist, whom Mary promoted to a place so near her person, would seem in itself to disarm suspicion, and to be a circumstance of all others the most likely to recommend him to the notice of a young and widowed sovereign, for a post of that description, which could not be held for an hour by those of more exalted position, or more imposing exterior, without raising presumptuous hopes, or at least provoking censorious tongues. In him were united a deformity which could not but be an antidote to passion; a meanness of extraction which no ambition, how vaulting soever, could remedy, and talent equal to the nice and nervous task of conducting the foreign correspondence of a princess, so beset from within and without; plied with offers of marriage from almost every unmarried prince in Europe; already connected by so many ties with the house of France; and jealously watched at home by more than one pretender. There were, of course, inconveniences attending the selection made by Mary, and in truth it is difficult to see what selection she could have made that would not have proved fatal, or at least disastrous. The insignificance and ugliness of his person, coupled with the lowliness of his origin, and foreign birth, rendered him particularly odious to the half savage nobles, who, with the characteristic vanity of

savages, had such sublime ideas of their own merit ; though, had the position been held by one of themselves, and that one admitted to so confidential an intercourse with their beautiful sovereign ; it is not in the nature of things that the jealousy, as well as the pride of the others should not have been exasperated to the utmost. Most assuredly those who wrought so industriously to destroy her husband's influence, would not endure to have her closeted with a noble and handsome secretary. But the strongest proof that his influence over the Queen, if different in kind or degree, from what their official relations warranted, never exceeded the bounds of friendship, is the fact that Darnley, in the very springtide of his courtship, attached himself to Rizzio, as well from congeniality of tastes with the Queen in love of music, as from a desire to interest the influential secretary in his suit, which he did effectually, and for all, so fatally. Had Darnley suspected a rival, or worse than a rival, and even were his ambition such as to make a Queen, however sullied, a prize worth any risk ; he would have antedated Rizzio's hour, and found other means to reach the hand of his mistress than the pleading or intrigue of her reputed minion. We now quote Miss Strickland.

“ The Earl of Moray withdrew from Stirling in disgust, declaring that he could no longer endure the superstitions practised in the chapel royal, after he had rendered the Queen as uncomfortable as he could, by his ill-will to Darnley, and his jealousy of the daily increasing importance of David Rizzio, who was observed to spend much time by Darnley's bedside, to whom he carried all the secret business of the court and council chamber. David was now performing in the absence of Lethington the functions of secretary of state, and in effect was the Queen's principal adviser since the mysterious bond of friendship that had united him with Darnley. Rizzio was suspected of moving the Queen to wed Darnley ; but suspicion, which generally outstrips the truth, fell far short of it in this matter, for the research of that illustrious northern antiquary, Prince Labanoff, has brought to light a contemporary record which indicates the fact that nearly four months before the solemnization of their nuptials in Holyrood, Mary Stuart and Darnley were married privately at Stirling castle, in David Rizzio's apartment, which he had fitted up as a Romish chapel for that purpose.”

* * * * *

“ In promoting Mary's marriage with Darnley, her deformed

Piedmontese secretary acted in a manner which completely refutes the calumnies subsequently devised by his murderers for the twofold purpose of justifying their own guilt, and impugning the reputation of their royal mistress. Political malice will assert any absurdity; but who can believe that a courtier, occupying the position slanderously assigned to David Rizzio, in the favour of a young and beautiful female sovereign, would have wished to see her united to a prince, in the flower of his age, whose personal attractions and graceful accomplishments had already captivated her fancy, and might naturally be expected, to gain paramount influence over her heart? The part of a faithful servant, anxious to secure the happiness of his royal benefactress, had been performed by David in recommending her to wed a consort likely to prove agreeable to herself and acceptable to her English friends, and by uniting her claims with his, to strengthen her title to the royal succession of that realm. Up to this period the conduct of Darnley had been popular and good; nor could his greatest enemies urge a single point in which he had laid himself open to attack."—Vol. iv., pp. 115, 118.

Some pages further on, the triumph of Rizzio on the success of his co-operation with the wishes of his queen, and the object of her choice, is proclaimed by himself, in terms little like those we should expect from a discarded minion, or even a supplanted favourite.

"'Te Deum laudamus—it is done and cannot now be broken,' was the exultant exclamation of Mary's lively little Piedmontese secretary, in response to the thrilling echo of the long amen that pealed through the stately aisles of Holyrood chapel, at the conclusion of the sponsal rites, for he was well aware of the informality of the private marriage between the princely cousins which had been plighted three months before at Stirling, in his chamber, to sanction such near relatives in contracting wedlock with each other. Poor David, whom Melville terms 'a pleasant fellow,' had truly performed the part of the bridegroom's friend upon the present occasion, by rejoicing vehemently in his joy, and deserved not the payment it was his hard lot to receive from the fickle and ungrateful boy-husband of Mary Stuart."—Vol. iv. p. 168.

Miss Strickland does not appear to lay much stress upon the fact of Rizzio being the real or reputed contriver of a Catholic counter-movement in Scotland. The conspirators who nourished the vanity of Darnley were not less hostile to him than to Rizzio; and they flattered with the prospect of reigning over them, the man whom those that were in their councils, or had sagacity enough to see

through them, predicted they would not suffer to live. The crime of Darnley, in their eyes, was his natural, and if he knew how to use it, his legitimate influence over the Queen—the crime of Rizzio in Darnley's was his unwillingness to desert his mistress, and take part in the conspiracy. The rebel lords who joined in the bond for the assassination of Rizzio, might possibly have been under the influence of fanaticism, or it would at least have furnished them with a plausible and consistent plea, but that Darnley, who was a violent speculative Catholic, should have espoused the interest of the ranters he so despised, was too gross an absurdity even for the easy digestion of the time. The leading fact throughout this lamentable chapter of Mary's history is the perfidious desire of Darnley to compass the supreme power at any price, and the advantage taken of his folly by those who alone were destined to enjoy it. He was, in fact, like William III., impatient of the position of prince consort, but unlike William he did not honourably stipulate for a different position at the outset. He accepted the place, and took on the yoke, a light and sweet one surely, and then plotted to deprive his benefactress of crown, liberty, and it might be, life; for he very coldly makes provision in his bond with the confederates, for the event of her death; securing the devolution of the crown first to himself, and then, to his *father*: a speculation which would seem to have contemplated a more tragical sequence of events than ensued, at least immediately, upon the assassination of Rizzio in the chamber of the Queen; the death, in short, without dagger or potion of his wife, and unborn offspring, at the bare sight of the horrors perpetrated in her presence.

It would hardly be credited that the first cause of estrangement between Darnley and Rizzio was the unwillingness of the latter to accompany that misguided prince to a disorderly house; and it will add little to the credit of the Queen's traducers, that, according as Rizzio's favour with Darnley diminished, Moray, the prime mover of every plot against her person and government, and the chief conspirator in this especial matter, sought every means to propitiate his victim, and lull his suspicions; but we have proof of every particular from hostile sources. Randolph speaks in terms, of his eagerness to secure the sovereign power. "I cannot tell," he says, "what mis-

liking of late there hath been between her grace and her husband; he presseth earnestly for the matrimonial crown which she is loth hastily to grant, but willing to keep in store until she know how well he is worthy to enjoy such a sovereignty." In another letter to Leicester, speaking of Darnley, he says, "I know that there are practices in hand between the father and the son to come by the crown against her will. I know that if it take effect which is intended, David, with the consent of the king, shall have his throat cut within these ten days. Many things grievouser and worse than these things are brought to my ears, yea, of things intended against her own person, which, because I think better to keep secret than write to Mr. Secretary; I speak not to them, but now to your Lordship."

The duty of an ambassador, at least of an English ambassador in those days, it will thus appear, was not confined to its modern limits of telling lies in other countries for the benefit of your own. He was understood to be perpetually guilty of what in a subject would be most terrible misprision of treason, and something more; he was to be the depository of designs for the assassination of the Sovereign's friends, for her own deposition, perhaps death; and give all the support and countenance he could to such designs, without committing those who sent him,—and it is on the authority of such a man as that, and of the still more guilty, and still less trustworthy Scotsman, nearest to the throne in office and in blood, who corresponded with him; that we are to believe every villany they think fit to charge upon her to whom no one movement was possible that would save her from censure or perhaps from destruction. We shall close this branch of the subject with an extract which sets forth the real motives of Darnley and the other conspirators in the assassination of David Rizzio.

"In the midst of the fetes and public entertainments given by Mary and Darnley at Holyrood Abbey, in honour of the Earl of Bothwell's nuptials, the conspiracy for depriving Mary of her regal authority was actively proceeding. The history of that conspiracy has been little investigated by those who, misled by the libels of Buchanan and the narration of the assassins, imagine Darnley's absurd jealousy of David Rizzio to have been the exciting cause, and the assassination of that defenceless foreigner the principal object of a league which included not only the excited Scotch

lords and their confederates at home, but the leading members of the English cabinet, the English sovereign herself, and her authorities at the border. Elizabeth would have cared nothing for the conjugal wrongs, had such existed, of her contumacious subject, in a marriage contracted by him in defiance of her express prohibition, but it suited well her astute policy to allow her ministers and secret-service men to tamper with his ambition and folly in order to render him the instrument in destroying the wife of his bosom, and those hopes of a successor which had strengthened Mary Stuart's government in Scotland, and rendered her party in England too formidable to be contemplated without uneasiness. Elizabeth had uncourteously refused to treat Darnley as the king consort of Scotland, but through her emissaries she gave him every reason to expect support from her in case he should be induced to make a bold attempt to wrest the regal authority from his wife. So far was the murder of Rizzio from being the original object of this confederacy, that he was actually wooed by Darnley in the first instance to become a party to it; and if he could have betrayed the cause of his royal benefactress, he would have reaped any reward he might have pleased to demand; for being the channel through which all Mary's private foreign correspondence was carried on, he could doubtless by his revelations have furnished some more plausible pretext for her deposition and judicial murder. But Rizzio refused to play the Judas, and considered it, moreover, his duty to warn the Queen that some iniquitous intrigue was on foot, to which her husband, with his father, and some of the confederates, with the banished lords, were parties. Mary at first knew not how to credit this sad intimation, but having ascertained that a secret meeting of suspected persons was to take place one evening in her husband's chamber, she entered unexpectedly and surprised them together. The guilty conclave exhibited signs of confusion and dismay, but Darnley assumed an imperious tone of conjugal authority, gave her ungentle words, accused her of listening to spies and tale-bearers, and of watching him, and intruding her company when not desired by him. Mary proudly withdrew, and entered her husband's apartments no more. Darnley's personal vanity was piqued by this assumption of coldness and disdain on the part of the royal beauty; and although it had been caused by his own unkindness, he put on the airs of an injured person, complained resentfully of her 'coying him,' and imperiously pretended to believe her personal estrangement was caused by preference for another.

"The only man with whom the Queen was much in private, was David Rizzio, and this the nature of his office rendered necessary; while the defects of his person were such as almost to defy scandal itself to insinuate that she who was esteemed the most beautiful princess in the world, could prefer him to the husband of her choice, a prince so eminently distinguished by nature, with external graces

of form, features, and complexion, and who excelled in riding, dancing, tilting, and all manly and courtly exercises.

“The testimonies of David Rizzio's ugliness and deformity are numerous. At the head of these stands Buchanan, who writes that ‘his face spoiled his ornaments and rich dress,’ and that ‘the Queen could not amend the defects of his person.’ Another contemporary author of ‘*Le livre de la Mort de Marie Stuart*,’ printed in 1657, declares he was ‘*disgracié de corps*,’ and of mature years, but great sagacity; the author of ‘*Martyre de Marie*’ says: the credit he enjoyed with his mistress was not on account of any beauty he possessed, being an old man and ugly, swarthy, and ill favoured, but because of his great fidelity, wisdom, prudence, and many other excellent endowments.’ ‘Connaco declares that he was old and deformed, but of spotless faith, and possessed of rare talents. Louis Garzon, Conseiller de finances to the King of France, gives the most conclusive testimony of all, for he says, ‘I was well acquainted with David Rizzio, from whom I received many civilities in that court. He was in years, of dark hue, very ill favoured, but of a rare prudence, and very skilful in business.’ But inasmuch as the doom of this faithful servant had been sealed from the hour he refused to join in the conspiracy against his royal benefactress, it was necessary to draw some scheme for shedding his blood. The confidence reposed in him by the Queen rendered him as a foreigner, very obnoxious to the national prejudices of the nobles, and his devotion to his unpopular religion made him an object of ill-will and suspicion to the people in general. It was industriously reported that he was a pensioner of the Pope, and intended to use his influence with the Queen for the overthrow of the Reformed Church, and this might possibly be true, yet is certain he had done nothing either to furnish matter for impeachment, or a criminal process, or there would have been no necessity for the lawless proceedings to which his enemies resorted, nor yet for the absurd calumnies whereby they sought to excuse their crime. The murder of David Rizzio was, however, only intended as the opening move in the attack on the Queen, and in this it was expedient to obtain the co-operation of her besotted husband.

“Meanwhile the Earl of Morton, who had first incited Darnley to enter into those treasonable intrigues against the Queen, suddenly forsook the meetings of the conspirators and appeared disposed to abandon the league. Alarmed at his demeanour, the confederates sent Andrew Kerr of Faudonside, and Sir John Bellenden, the justice clerk,—that great law officer being, to his eternal disgrace, a coadjutor in the treason,—to inquire the cause of his alienation. Morton replied that it was on account of the King's persisting in claiming the Earldom of Angus; and was with some difficulty persuaded to meet him in the Earl of Lennox's Chamber. A family treaty was entered into then and there, whereby Darnley and his

father renounced once more for themselves and Lady Lennox all claims on that patrimony in favour of Morton's nephew and ward the young Earl of Angus. This sacrifice having purchased the full co-operation of Morton in their enterprize, the bond or secret articles were drawn between Darnley and the banished Lords, in which it was stipulated that Darnley should obtain their pardon and recall, on condition that they should obtain for him the crown matrimonial of Scotland, and that in the event of the Queen's death, he should be declared the rightful successor, and his father next heir after himself, and that the Lords would pursue, slay, and extirpate all who opposed this resolution. * * *

The cause of religion was of course brought prominently forward in the general and more public bond, yet what grimace was this for Darnley, the most violent and bigotted Roman Catholic in the realm; he who had done what Mary never attempted to do—inhibited John Knox from preaching, rated the lords for not going with him to Mass, tossed the psalm book into the fire, and swore he would have a mass in St. Giles'—now pledging himself to keep the religion as it had been established by the Queen, that wise and tolerant princess whom they were preparing in return to supersede in favour of so unworthy a successor. Small was their care for religion, but Darnley had guaranteed to them the possession of their unlawful acquisitions, the mammon of unrighteousness being their idol. 'The King and his father subscribed the bond,' says Knox, 'for they durst not trust the King's word without his signet.' Lennox undertook the office of returning to England that he might assure Moray and the other outlaws they might return with safety. It must be remembered that the reason Mary had refused to treat with them through the offered mediation of Mauvissière in the preceding September, was because they had conspired against her husband's life. Darnley and Lennox were now willing to pardon this on condition of their conspiring to overthrow Mary and transfer the Government of the realm to Darnley. Lennox, though a proscribed outlaw himself in England, was allowed to enter that realm and confer with Bedford and Randolph, his previous foes, and proceed to Newcastle without the slightest danger or inconvenience, for the English Government was well aware of all that was going on, and Moray had pledged himself to obtain through his friend Cecil the deliverance of Lady Lennox, with leave for them to join him and Darnley at Holyrood.

"The murderous instrument entitled 'Ane Bond, made by my Lord of Moray and certain other noblemen with him before the slaughter of Davie' is still in the charter chest of the Earl of Leven, at Melville, having the autograph signatures of the six banished Lords, headed by the Earl of Moray, who signs himself James Stuart. It is dated at Newcastle, the 2nd of March, 1565-6. On Sunday, the 3rd of March, began the general fasting at Edinburgh, which always drew a concourse of the most disaffected of the half-

judaised zealots of the west country into the metropolis. The pulpits sounded notes of alarm on the all-exciting subject of popery, and the lessons were chosen from such passages of the Old Testament, as might be most readily perverted to the antichristian purpose of warrants for slaughter and persecution."—Vol. iv. pp. 262-7.

Our last extract has been somewhat too copious to admit of our giving many more ; or going at length into descriptions of scenes of bloodshed and intrigue with which the reader is perhaps, and in all likelihood, too familiar. We pass over the never-ending quarrels and reconciliations of Mary and her husband, his wearisome sea-saw of repentance and relapse, and his final abandonment to the meanest and most besotting vices, that almost remind one of the downward course of Lord Byron, save that the latter had some rays of genius to make us pity his fall. Even in these tiresome but necessary details are found important facts, which, perverted by the traducers of Mary Stuart to her ruin, and long surviving to her obloquy, have repaid the generous toil of her apologists, by proving to be altogether different from what they have been represented, and furnishing them not only with arguments of the insincerity of her enemies, but positive evidence of her own uprightness and willingness to conciliate her husband so far as might be compatible with duty. We are also compelled, however unwillingly, to omit the painfully interesting details of all that immediately preceded the death of the wretched Darnley. Miss Strickland has faithfully and laboriously collected every circumstance tending to the exculpation of the Queen. Her unwillingness to have him go to France ; her tender reception of him at a time when she is represented as giving him only a hasty and contemptuous interview ; her rejection of the proposal of a divorce, an expedient so ready and so characteristic of the times ; her wasting sorrow which bespoke love and regret, not anger or the purpose of revenge, these and a hundred other circumstances, distorted by her accusers, and neglected as trivial, or totally lost sight of by her friends ; are to be found in their right places, and doing the proper service in Miss Strickland's pages. Kindness to her husband during the illness which preceded his murder, but which his enemies and hers have tortured into the most repulsive feature of her imputed guilt, by representing it as an effort of superhuman, almost of superdiabolical hypocrisy, to lull

the suspicions of her victim ; has been rightly brought into comparison with the cares which she lavished on him in his illness before their public marriage, or with those she devoted to her first husband, for Mary was no novice in the ministrations of a *sœur-grise*. Nor are the more negative proofs of Mary's innocence omitted, which, though they are not of equal weight with the others, are by no means fanciful or such as would be rejected in a case like this, which, as we have said, is one of purely circumstantial evidence. Suffering, as Darnley was, from that always terrible, but then most mysterious malady, the small pox ; one current of cold air, (and Mary, it would appear, well knew its effect,) was the only assassin needed ; affected tenderness in lifting the curtain of his litter, would have been worth barrels of gunpowder, false keys, and the other dramatic accessories that an assassin on her own account would never have thought of, unless besotted to the last degree, which Mary, of all women, assuredly was not. A more vulgar, but equally certain and almost as discreet a piece of management, would have been to tamper with his medicines. There was no danger of a post-mortem examination, and the art had been pushed to the most delicate refinements in that very age ; refinements, which happily for the interests of justice, have not been preserved to the members of our burial societies ; and yet we are to suppose, on the evidence of the alleged correspondence with Bothwell, that she sent her own physician to rescue her husband from the jaws of death, and adjourned her release ; merely for the gratification of hearing the explosion at Holyrood. The further circumstance, too, in opposition to M. Mignet, that the house in which Darnley was lodged was his own decided choice, and not that of Mary, is duly noted, and, indeed, we are not aware of a single matter omitted which could be introduced in favour of Mary, or in refutation of her accusers.

The only remaining point which our space will permit us to notice for the present is the way in which the Queen's alleged complicity with Bothwell, in her abduction to Dunbar, has been treated by Miss Strickland. It is well known that all who take part with Mary's adversaries regard the abduction, so soon to be followed by marriage, as a perfect sham—as an unusually transparent pretence, reflecting a credibility upon every previous charge that might have seemed doubtful, so as to convert suspicion

into certainty. The grounds upon which this position is maintained, are simple and intelligible enough; but we believe they may be reduced to three; the extraordinary favours lavished upon Bothwell previous to the murder of the king; the letters real or apocryphal in the silver casket; the marriage and subsequent demeanour of the Queen. Taken in themselves, the favours conferred upon Bothwell were certainly considerable, and the accumulation of functions and powers in his single person were formidable to a degree. But fortunately for the character of Mary they are not naked and unrelated facts. Her favour to Bothwell never equalled that extended to Moray and to others, and was in a great measure the growth of circumstances. That countenance began to be shown to him at a time when her motives were above suspicion, and when her love for Darnley was said by the English spies to be the result of enchantments and filters, the brewage we believe of Lady Lennox. By a brave, sudden, and skilful exercise of royal prerogative, which resembles in its vigour, as well as its duration, the bearing of Richard the Second, before Wat Tyler and his rout in Smithfield, she preserved the rights of Bothwell, though he remained for a considerable time afterwards in banishment. She knew he once had in contemplation the deed he afterwards consummated, and for that design had banished him, but whom had she not been obliged to banish and recall in turn? In the fond persuasion she was unassailable under the protection of a husband, she considered it safe, and even if dangerous, her sole resource in extreme peril; to recall Bothwell and reinstate him in his command. Her nobles, as a body, were traitors and rebels, and Bothwell, whatever else might have been his failings, was at least proof to seduction from England,—he was, in fact, the only one in the realm that had been in high office, and yet not in the pay of Elizabeth. At a moment when the great lords were actually in arms against her government, was she to neglect the aid of the most powerful nobleman in Scotland, who united in himself hereditary offices, not only of the greatest dignity, but of the most real importance, who had a principality under his dominion on the confines of her enemy, who was acknowledgedly the greatest and best soldier in Scotland, and who was above all, so far at least as the country was concerned, “one true amongst a host?” Confiding, as

we have every reason to believe she did, in the protection of a husband whom all admit her to have loved at the time, she recalled Bothwell, and from that period forward there was nothing in her relations with him more than those official relations strictly warranted. There have been no freedoms, certainly no public freedoms, imputed to her like those in which Elizabeth was accustomed to indulge, and which the presence even of ambassadors was unable to check; and the only proof which, however shadowy, has even the semblance of substance, must be looked for in the letters whose history, and that of the controversy regarding them, we endeavoured to give in the number of this Journal to which we have referred already. A stronger argument still against any of what may be called the remote proofs of her having lent herself to a concerted abduction, was the part she took in promoting the marriage of Bothwell with Lady Jane Gordon. Surely no one will pretend it could have been with a view to her union with Bothwell that she laboured so zealously for his marriage with another. Would it not rather seem, that regretting as she did the state necessity that forced her to employ so aspiring a servant, she determined as far as in her lay, to diminish the danger, whatever it might be, of his presence at her court, and of his influence in the country. As regards the actual abduction we shall draw upon Miss Strickland herself for the history and the reasoning.

“The Queen having been delayed and impeded by so severe an attack of illness on the very commencement of her journey, must have proceeded slowly, and could not have reached Linlithgow, where she was to pass the night, till late. It is natural to suppose that being exhausted with the pain she had suffered, and the fatigue of passing so many hours in the saddle, she would, in compliance with the advice of her physician, and the entreaties of her ladies, have retired to bed immediately on her arrival, taken composing medicine, and endeavoured to obtain the repose of which she was in need. It is asserted, nevertheless, on the authority of that extravagant tissue of falsehood put forth by Moray, under the name of the second confession of French Paris, that she had a second interview with the Laird of Ormistoun, one of the murderers of her husband, and sent a letter to Bothwell by him that same night.

“That the Laird of Ormistoun was never questioned on the subject of this alleged correspondence between Mary and Bothwell, in which he was alleged to have been employed as the bearer of these letters the night before her abduction, must be regarded as proof-

positive that nothing of the kind took place ; for if such a fact could have been established by his evidence, no matter how extorted, it would have corroborated the assertion of the conspirators, that she acted under the influence of a guilty passion for the murderer of her husband. But as the confession of Ormistoun is silent upon that point, having been written down in the presence of the honest minister, Brand, who, though ranked with her foes, was too honourable a man to permit interpolations to be made for the purpose of dishonouring his hapless sovereign, the charge of her complicity with Bothwell rests solely on the unverified assertions of the usurpers of her regal power, the credibility of the eight letters produced by Morton, and the so-called second confession of Nicholas Hubert, *alias*, French Paris, who is made to confess delivering a letter to Bothwell a day before it could, according to its own showing, have been written ; the 24th being plainly indicated by the allusion to the journey from Stirling, ‘yesterday.’ [April 23.] It will be necessary to quote this letter.

“‘My Lord,—Since my letter written, your brother-in-law, [Huntley, that was,] came to me very sad, and has asked me my counsel what he should do to-morrow, because there be many folks here, and among others the Earl of Sutherland, who would rather die, considering the good they have so lately received from me, than suffer me to be carried away, they conducting me ; and that he feared there should some trouble happen of it of the other side, and that it should be said that he were unthankful to have betrayed me. I told him he should have resolved with you upon all, and that he should avoid, if he could, them that were most instructed. He has resolved to write to you by my advice.’

“And here the usual discrepancy of falsehood confutes its own fictions, for the forger goes on to say,—

“‘We had *yesterday* three hundred horse of his and Livingstone’s. For the honour of God be accompanied rather with more than less, for that is my principal care. I go to write my despatch, and pray God to send us a happy interview shortly. I write in haste, to the end you may be advertised in time.’

“Thus we see a letter purporting to be written the day after the Queen had started from Stirling to Linlithgow,—consequently on the 24th of April, the day of her abduction—expresses the greatest uncertainty as to what Bothwell’s intentions were, which is incompatible with the assertion in Paris’ confession, ‘that Bothwell very early on that morning made him the bearer both of a letter and a message to the Queen, telling her he would meet her the same day on the bridge.’ So the letter confutes the confession, and the confession the letter, affording a striking illustration of the old proverb, that ‘falsifiers require to have good memories.’ * * * * *

“Instead of being guarded by an escort of three hundred horsemen, as artfully insinuated in the seventh of the supposititious letters, Mary was so slenderly attended on her journey from Lin-

lithgow to Edinburgh on the fatal 24th of April, that her train did not exceed twelve persons. Bothwell, who had meantime armed and mounted a thousand of his followers, rode boldly out of the west port of Edinburgh at the head of his company, apparently for the performance of his duty as high sheriff, which required him to meet her majesty at the verge of the county, to receive her with the customary honours due to the sovereign, and conduct her to her palace of Holyrood. His real object was to overpower and capture her in some lonely part of the road. He had, if Sir William Drury's information on the subject be correct, conferred very early that morning with his brother-in-law, Huntley, 'with whom he did directly break of his determination of having the Queen to Dunbar, which in no respect Huntley would yield unto.' It is possible, therefore, that it was in consequence of being warned by Huntley that she was in danger of being ambushed on the road, Mary either started earlier than was anticipated, or pushed forward with such unwonted speed to get into Edinburgh, that Bothwell, instead of surprising her, as he had calculated, in a lonely part of the old Linlithgow road, which then ran in almost a straight line near the sea coast, encountered her and her little train in the suburban hamlet, anciently called Foulbriggs, between Coultbridge and the West Port. If he had been ten minutes later she would have escaped him altogether, for she was within three quarters of a mile of the castle, and almost under the walls of Edinburgh, but near as she was to a place of refuge it was impossible for her to reach it. A thousand horsemen, mailed and equipped with weapons of war, were treasonably interposed between her and the West Port. Resistance to such a force was out of the question. Her attendants were disarmed and overpowered in a moment, and Bothwell dashing forward, seized her bridle-rein, and turning her horse's head, hurried her away with him to Dunbar as his prisoner. It is proper to verify this statement of the real place and manner of Mary Stuart's capture, not merely by a marginal reference to an authority inaccessible to the great body of my readers, but by a quotation of the very words of the act of parliament for the forfeiture of Bothwell and sixty-four of his accomplices, 1 James, VI., which, after reciting the murder of the 'late King Henry,' proceeds in these words:—'And also for their treasonable interception of the most noble person of our most illustrious mother, Mary, Queen of Scots, on her way from Linlithgow to the town of Edinburgh, near the bridges vulgarly called Foulbriggs, besetting her with a thousand men equipped in the manner of war, in the month of April last.' The fullest, the most satisfactory, and explicit testimony of the forcible nature of the royal victim's abduction follows in these words:—'She, suspecting no evil from any of her subjects, and least of all from the Earl Bothwell, to whom she had shown as great offices of liberality and benevolence as prince could show to good subject, he, by force and violence, treasonably seized her

most noble person, put violent hands upon her, not permitting her to enter her own town of Edinburgh in peace, but carried her away that same night to the Castle of Dunbar, against her will, and there detained her as a prisoner for twelve days.' " * * * *

" A vast amount of falsehood is overthrown by the parliamentary record defining the when, where, and how Mary's capture was effected by Bothwell. The act was framed within seven months after the offence was perpetrated, and it behoved to be correct, because several persons assisted in that parliament, as Huntley, Lethington, Sir James Melville, and others, who were not only present when the abduction was effected, but were carried away with their royal mistress as prisoners to Dunbar. The statute for Bothwell's forfeiture, reciting the overt treasons he had committed, was, moreover, proclaimed to the people of Edinburgh by the heralds, first from the windows of the Talbooth, where the parliament then sat, then from the Market Cross, and other public places, in the ears of hundreds, who might actually have been eye-witnesses of the facts alleged.

" The credibility of the charges against Mary Stuart, charges no less opposed to probability than inconsistent with the whole tenor of her life, and holy calmness of her death, is grounded by her adversaries on her supposed collusion with Bothwell, when he made public seizure on her person, and carried her off to Dunbar, she having, as they pretend, secretly encouraged and excited him to that measure. But the united voices of the three estates of Scotland assembled in parliament under an influence so hostile to her, as to have robbed her of her crown and personal liberty, acquit her of all foreknowledge or suspicion of the designs of Bothwell. 'She suspected,' declares the act of his forfeiture, 'no evil from any of her subjects, and least of all from him.' He was her Prime Minister, her Lord Admiral, Lieutenant of all the borders, and High Sheriff of Edinburgh and the Lothians, whose bounden duty it was to meet and convey her, and defend her in case of danger, with his '*posse comitatus*.' She, therefore, 'suspected no evil,' and even if she had, resistance was impossible. It seems withal that he was provided with a plausible tale in reply to any remonstrance she might have offered, when he took her by the bridle-rein and turned her horse in a contrary direction to that in which she was proceeding, 'deceitfully assuring her that she was in imminent danger, and beseeching her to allow him to provide for her personal safety by allowing him to conduct her to one of his castles.'

" Without the slightest consideration for the fatigue of his royal victim, who had been suffering so recently from a severe and alarming attack of illness the preceding day, on her journey from Stirling to Linlithgow, Bothwell hurried the captive Queen the same night to Dunbar, a weary distance of twenty miles, she having already ridden from Linlithgow nearly to the gates of Edinburgh." —Vol. v. pp. 269, 276.

It is impossible to disprove much more completely the charge of concert between Mary and Bothwell in her abduction. Every circumstance in the matter shows that although Bothwell's enemies favoured that imputation in the first instance, so as to secure him from interruption in the accomplishment of an enterprise which they knew would work his ruin, along with that of Mary; it was not put forward as a public charge upon the rolls of parliament, where it ought naturally to find its place, but that the very reverse was affirmed, even before it became the duty of James the Sixth, in regard to his mother's memory, to place on record her entire freedom from participation in that outrage. The fact of her marriage following so suddenly, is far indeed, from being decisive of her connivance in the abduction which led to it. Her total seclusion, and that other circumstance which it is enough to notice even thus darkly, which at the very least is incapable of being disproved, and which is reiterated in public documents; go far in explanation, though hardly in excuse, of this worst weakness in her life. What gives the matter a double aspect, rendering it doubtful whether the connection with Bothwell was on that account more criminal or less so, is the fact, very fairly suggested by Miss Strickland, that Mary, knowing the rules of the Church as well as she must have done, did not consider the marriage binding, and that she submitted to the vain ceremony in the hope of disarming the suspicions of Bothwell, and escaping at the earliest opportunity. We regret we are not at liberty to enter into the discussion of her attempted escape from Dunbar, and her recapture by Bothwell, as ill-starred as her original abduction. Few have made allowance for the effect of illness, abandonment, perplexity, and every element of irresolution by which she was encompassed; in producing a state of mind such as to disqualify her for resistance to the threats, violence, and importunity of Bothwell. On the other hand, it was not in Mary's character to shrink from danger, or from submitting her fortunes to the arbitrament of war, as she had shown on more than one occasion; and therefore we are entitled to infer that her final abandonment of Bothwell was not from pure aversion to the shedding of blood, though her nature always recoiled from judicial executions, and to pardon was always more grateful to her than to condemn. These, and many other

arguments, fairly and ingeniously put, we have been obliged to notice thus cursorily, and to omit the greater number altogether. The proper course for the reader will be to consult Miss Strickland's volumes himself. There are some few things to which we might take exception, but they have no regard to the gist of the work. Notwithstanding that Miss Strickland is so generally well-informed, she falls into droll mistakes with regard to Catholic doctrine and practice, which show that a Protestant, however well-inclined or well-informed—and without wishing to be ungallant we may be permitted to say, a lady in particular—ought not to approach questions of the kind without satisfying herself as to the accuracy of her descriptions. In one instance she speaks of the Roman Communion as “the most corrupt form of the *Latin Church*,” a figure of speech which, though it has no designation proper in Aristotle or elsewhere, is not altogether unlike the similarity between “Cæsar and Pompey, especially Cæsar.” Again, she speaks of the dirge, as held by Catholics, essential to salvation; and in another place says the same thing quite as undoubtingly of the last sacraments. Perhaps if she prosecute her enquiries a little further, she will unlearn many of her existing ideas, but as far as we are ourselves concerned we can afford to forgive mistakes of this kind, when the spirit of the work in which they are found is so perfect. We take leave of the book, so far as it has gone, with a very sincere wish that what remains to be accomplished may be not less successful in its execution, and that its popularity may be equal to its deserts. It is not one of the essential properties of truth to be agreeable, and feeling that in proportion as the circumference of Miss Strickland's popularity enlarges itself, some ray of truth will reach a quarter yet unvisited, and some darksome recesses be illuminated, we cannot but wish her increase of strength, courage, and reputation.

ART. III.—1. *Fresenius' Instructions in Chemical Analyses.* London : Churchill.

2. *Galloway's Manual of Qualitative Analyses.* London : Churchill.

3. *Abel and Bloxam's Handbook of Chemistry.* London : Churchill.

4. *Faraday's Lectures.* London : Longmans.

IN our days, and in those of the generation that is now passing away, the science of chemistry has grown up from a puny stature into gigantic proportions, and with its giant's size has attained to a gigantic strength. Still with its colossal power and might it has, when this has been needed, refined upon its original delicacy. Ever in operation chemistry sometimes astonishes us with the tremendousness of its results, while at other times we are forced to admire the extreme minuteness of its proceedings. Chemistry can make explosive compounds that may destroy a city, and yet can detect in, and separate the hundredth part of a grain of arsenic from, the stomach of a poisoned man, or the one four hundred and fiftieth thousandth of a grain of iodine in a wine-glass full of mineral water. Chemistry directs the metallurgist in the management of his huge furnaces, and also the manufacturer of a pin ; it penetrates into the cook's kitchen, and yet the highest refinements of luxury, as far as material things can be, are dependent upon it for their properties. Without the assistance at least of chemistry, the powerful steam-engine would scarcely do its mission, and yet without it the soldering of a tin kettle cannot be rightly performed. If chemistry sometimes wields its power for the purposes of destroying life, by its means more food is produced, and from its stores medicine draws some of her most useful remedies. Yet all these powers, and much more, have been mainly acquired by chemistry in less than a century, and from the hour when Cavendish analyzed water to the other day, its onward course has been uniformly continuous. But even Jupiter nods, and for a moment as it were chemistry is reposing. Perhaps its slumbers are disturbed by vague dreams of allotropism, and like hypotheses, that are destined it may be to dim its hitherto unclouded

escutcheon, and give another proof that everything in this world, even science itself, is subject to error, and doomed too often to receive wounds from those who should be its guardians and protectors. Be this as it may, this present resting-time seems suitable enough for considering the history and present state of chemical science.

At first sight it would appear that the best plan of narrating the history of chemistry is, to detail the labours of the chemists of each succeeding age, but this is not so. As, when only some few hundreds of plants were known, the botanist could arrange them according to any artificial system that he pleased, but found it necessary, when the genera multiplied upon him, to arrange them into different *natural* families and orders, so it is with chemistry. It is indeed so extensive a science, or rather a-series of sciences, that in narrating its career it is necessary, unless done on a very extended scale, often to merge individuals, and regard merely the rise and progress of great epochs. Even in doing this, it is sometimes necessary to sink chronology, for often we can trace the seed of a great principle that lies dormant for ages ere it is vivified into an existence. Perhaps the history of chemistry is naturally divided into that of 1st. the origin and progress of chemistry, among the ancient Semitic nations; 2nd. of the chemistry of the Arabians, and the alchemists, the latter being the first great outburst of methodic chemistry; 3rd. of Paracelsus, and his school, or of the first avowed school of empirical chemistry; 4th. of Van Helmont, and the new methodical school of iatro-chemistry; 5th. of the commencement of the re-establishment of the rational dogmatical school; 6th. of Black and the pneumatics; 7th. of Lavoisier and the French school; 8th. of Davy and the electrical school; and 9, of Liebig and the organic chemists.

Chemistry is essentially a science of the Semitic race, no nations not belonging to this great division of mankind having ever cultivated it with success. Indeed, its very name, *χημια*, is probably derived from our great ancestor Shem of the Vulgate, and Chem of the Egyptians. Farther, it appears almost certain that post-diluvian chemistry had its origin, certainly a humble one, in Egypt. History, tradition, and archæology, in fact combine to tell us that it was in this country that science of all kinds sprang up. The scientific inquirer, who considers the

physical geography and the geology of the country around Thebes, cannot fail to be struck with the suitableness of such a locality for the birth-place of chemistry. The first chemistry was unquestionably practical metallurgy, *i. e.* the extraction and management of the metals. If, then, we regard the geology around Thebes, we see that on the western side of the Nile there occurs to the north, limestone, then sandstone, and that both are intersected with primitive mountains of quartz, and long stretches of graywacke, or transition rocks. The eastern ridge of the Nile, also, pretty near to the Delta, has limestone formations, but as we go southward we find an immense quantity of granite, and when we arrive at Syene we come upon the worked quarries of that variety of it, called, from this circumstance, syenite. Between the Nile and the Red Sea the mountains are all primitive, and in about 28° of latitude we find in these primitive mountains the remains of what have been extensively-worked copper-mines. The valleys in this district, however, contain small formations of sandstone and primitive limestone.

Now gold occurs in the primary and transition rocks,* (whence it is generally washed away in grains by means of water,) copper in the same rocks and in sandstones; lead in the early limestone and sandstones, and also in the primitive; tin in the granite and transition rocks, and hematite or iron oxide in the primitive. That is, the Egyptian monarchy, of which Thebes was the capital, was surrounded abundantly by gold, and by ores of copper, tin, lead, and iron. It also contained a river, the banks of which varied much at different times of the year, and which would probably have in its mud a good deal of the gold that had been washed down from the primitive rocks, and the veins of quartz in the graywacke.

But the knowledge of metals was probably long antecedent to any familiarity with metallurgy. We know from archæology that there was a time when mankind was unacquainted with any metal that would form weapons or tools, and was consequently obliged to employ stone for the purpose, and yet was aware of the existence of gold and silver. We know farther, that in the very earliest

* Many parts of Egypt, and probably of the great desert on the opposite side of the Red Sea, likely contain much gold.

records these metals are spoken of as being quite familiar, and physical science points out to us that they are found in the beds of rivers that flow from primitive and metamorphic rocks. No doubt but that the early inhabitants of Thebes discovered these metals, and probably used them as ornaments. In order, however, to do this, no chemical knowledge whatever is necessary. But this is not the case with the two metals that we know mankind next discovered and employed. For we not only have the researches of the archæologists, but those likewise of ordinary antiquarians prove, that before the discovery of iron; copper, and, (but perhaps a little subsequently,) tin were known and used.* The alloy formed by these two metals constitutes bronze, and the metallic weapons and utensils of mankind were for a long time made of this compound. The tombs of the men of this bronze period never contain iron, and indeed, even Homer describes the weapons of his heroes as composed of copper, and although they were acquainted with iron, they are described as so unfamiliar with it, that Achilles offered an iron ball as one of his most valuable prizes at the games celebrated in honour of Patroclus.

The copper ore from which the Egyptians most probably extracted their copper, was the copper pyrites, or sulphuret of that metal. To obtain copper from this ore several processes of a chemical nature must have been gone through. The usual ore of tin is an oxide, and the details of the process followed to extract it would not be the same as in the case of copper, and the variation of the two processes and the necessity for the constancy of this variation imply a certain extended amount of practical chemical skill, and so also would the admixture of the two to constitute bronze.

Long after the bronze age had begun, and doubtless flourished after its own fashion, the art of extracting iron from its ores, and of the manufacture of that metal were discovered and understood.† The iron ore that the Egyptian metallurgists operated upon was almost certainly a hematite, and the mode of reducing the metal from it

* Perhaps the most interesting English work on this subject is Dr. Daniel Wilson's "Archæology of Scotland."

† See again Dr. Daniel Wilson's work as quoted above.

must have been different from the plan followed in the reduction of copper ore, and also most probably in that of the tin. Chemistry, even did it consist in traditional practices merely, had by this time not only commenced, but progressed.

The whole of the Egyptian chemistry was probably not communicated to the Greeks, and by them transmitted to the Romans. Nevertheless, among these two people chemistry continued in its own way to acquire at any rate new facts, and many of these undoubted ones. By the time of Constantine, (and with regard to most of the substances for long before,) the chemists of the empire knew, and could obtain all the pure metals as they are called, save one—platinum, and they likewise possessed zinc, although they confounded it with tin. Of the other, now ranked as elementary substances, they only knew sulphur. Their one acid was the acetic, but they had carbonate of soda, (which they called nitre), and potash. They were acquainted also with some metallic salts, and with alum, common salt, (marine salt), and ammoniacal salt, or our hydrochlorate of ammonia. Their knowledge of the earths and minerals was tolerable, and they were familiar with a good many oils, both fixed and essential. What was perhaps of still greater importance, they knew how to perform several chemical processes, such as crystallization, distillation, sublimation, expression, fusion, and many others. Their applications of chemistry, too, to the arts, were pretty numerous.

It is almost impossible, from our very imperfect evidence to decide as to how far the human intellect had gone in endeavouring to extract from the known facts of chemistry one or more general chemical principles. Something that had possibly been done in this way by the Egyptians was probably lost, and, moreover, the genius of the Greeks did not incline to what in our day is called mixed physical science, and the Romans were essentially an unscientific people. Still, we know that some little hypothesis was indulged in. The Greeks reduced all the forms of matter to the four elements of fire, air, earth, and water, but it would not appear that they understood the expression, element, in the same sense that modern chemists do, (viz., a substance that cannot, by any means that we possess, be resolved into two,) but under the name of the four elements they seem to have expounded a theory,

that all objects in the world were composed of air, earth, water, and fire, in which, after all, they were right enough. It has been supposed, too, that among the Egyptians at least, speculations were entertained to the effect that metals were compound in their nature, and some alchymists of a later date claimed the so-named Trismogistus as the founder of their art. But this is not supported by evidence, and quite contrary to all that history teaches us, of the progress of science. At first of all, (and indeed this holds good in almost everything connected with the mind of man,) isolated facts are diligently and laboriously stored; next in the healthy tone of early society, these, or some of these, are referred to principles, and these principles are more or less dogmatically taught. Rational dogmatism is created and transmitted to after generations, and always remains, however much it may suffer from passing clouds, the orthodox party. It is it that philosophically corrects previously established principles, that improves previous principles, or that adds new ones, always operating by the induction from observation of new facts, as connected with previous induction from previously observed facts. After a time two other plans of considering science invariably spring up. The one is that of Methodism, which, disdaining the cautious progress of rational dogmatism, striking out some new plan of her own, not from observation of facts, and consequent deduction, but from a fanciful hypothesis, or *method*, (whence the early name of this group of philosophical sectaries,) which is assumed as a law. The other is that of Scepticism or Empiricism, which denies the power of the human mind to generalize, and affirms that nothing is possible save for each individual to watch isolated facts. At any rate we shall see that this law holds true with regard to chemistry.

Some portion of the chemistry of the Egyptians, the Greeks, and the Romans, had doubtless from time to time spread to Persia, to India, and to Arabia, but after the fall of the Roman empire chemical science was in abeyance, until the brilliant outbreak of the Mahommedan Arabs. From the founding of Bagdad, in the eighth century, to the decadence of the Arabians in the twelfth, they not only incessantly cultivated chemistry, and added very materially to its stores, but they created the school that existed among the western Christians from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. Indeed, they did more, for it was

amongst them that the first great methodical sect, that of the alchemists, arose.

In considering the history of the Arabian school, of which Geber and Avicenna may be named as the most illustrious members, it is necessary to remember that our knowledge regarding it is very imperfect. The Arabian chemists certainly very much affected the progress of chemistry, and in consequence of so doing became acquainted with many chemical compounds that were unknown to their predecessors. It is now, however, quite impossible to define the chemical theories of the purely Arabian school, and any consideration of them may be here omitted. It is, indeed, of more importance to notice the fact, that among the Arabians the study of chemistry was combined with the practice of medicine, and that mineral acids, alkalies, and metallic salts, were not only known, but therapeutically used. This was not the case among previous medical men, and the innovation (certainly an improvement) ultimately lead to important results.

Of all the events, however, that characterized the Arabian chemists, the most interesting was the rise and progress (at least on a large scale) of alchemy. The general idea of this was, that the metals were all compound substances, that the baser metals, as they called them, differed from gold merely in containing various contaminations, and that if these contaminations could be got rid of, pure gold would be the result. Considered in the abstract, alchemy is not unphilosophical. When we say now-a-days that the metals are elementary bodies, all that we mean is, that we cannot resolve any metal into two elements, although it is quite possible that this may be done. The absurdity of alchemy was this, that its votaries did not from facts deduce the compound nature of metals, and then try to separate the pure part from the impure, according to the proceedings of the rational dogmatists, but they took the theory first and hoped the facts would follow. Alchemy was the first great outburst of methodism as applied to chemistry. The principle of alchemy may become the established principle of our day, but if so it will be, at least it is to be hoped it will be, honestly and scientifically come by. But it was not so with the alchemists.

The notion that we have of the so-called philosophical stone that was to effect the purification of the metals, is

probably very different from that of the Arabian methodics. Much as we are entitled to blame the false methodic system of the alchemists, this powder of projection was probably a methodical preparation, and not, as modern writers assert, a mere empirical substance. Methodism is indeed an aberration from right thinking, a sort of delirium as it were, but not a total deprivation of it, as empiricism is. This philosopher's stone subsequently, and perhaps long subsequently, came to be also regarded as the powder of life, or panacea for all diseases, and preventer of the debility of old age.

The chemical school that arose in the twelfth and three succeeding centuries among the Christians of the west, was derived from the Arabs, and was certainly strongly tinged with alchemy. Alchemy, with its powders of projection, would have lost its patent character of methodism, so totally opposed in its spirit to mediæval, or at least to mediæval Christian, orthodoxy. But we have probably jumped far too rapidly to the conclusion, that alchemy was all, or, indeed, anything but a very subsidiary part of the mediæval chemistry. On the contrary, it was probably more of a speculation than anything else, and not an article of scientific faith so much as a source of investigation as a relaxation.

Almost every one of these early Christian alchymists were members of monastic institutions. The earliest of these who attained a reputation was Albertus Magnus, who died at an extreme old age, towards the close of the thirteenth century. He was a Dominican, and at one time bishop of Ratisbon, but being released from his episcopal charge, he retired to his monastery at Cologne, where his time was mainly occupied by scientific pursuits. He was not only acquainted with many chemical processes and products not known to the Arabs, but many of his opinions have become accepted doctrines of chemistry. He considered the metals to be compounds of mercury, sulphur, and water, and believed in the possibility of separating the gold that he thought to be contained in the inferior metals. St. Thomas Aquinas was a pupil of his, and *his* chemical writings are remarkable as containing some now-familiar chemical expressions. But we may perhaps take as the type of this school, Roger Bacon. Amongst the various branches of learning that this great man investigated, chemistry was one, and it is plain from

his writings, that although he held the view of the compound nature of metals, his attempts at extracting gold were based upon principles quite compatible with science and philosophy, and his only statements about the reality of the philosopher's stone are, that others affirmed that they possessed it. In this respect his memory has been very unjustly calumniated by Voltaire. Bacon is surely no more to be blamed for speaking of others affirming that they could manufacture gold, or construct the powder of life, than any one now-a-days would be for speaking of mesmeric trances, or the affirmed results of homœopathy, although he knew the absurdity and falsehood of both.

These early religious chemists were probably also medical practitioners. Galen, however, was still a standing authority, and few remedies save Galenical ones, i. e., those derived from the vegetable world, were employed. Some chemical drugs were, however, doubtless beginning to be used, and Basil Valentine, a Saxon monk, paved the way, in the fourteenth century, for an innovation in this respect, that had much influence upon chemistry. He introduced antimonials into practice, and is said to have experimented upon his brother monks with them with such bad results, that the metal has been called antimony, or *αντι μονος* ever since.

But a strange innovation was at hand, and for the first time Pyrrhonism dawned upon the science. The empiric Paracelsus—the Luther of chemistry—appeared. Like Luther, Paracelsus had the desire to attack what was believed, to throw his whole soul and energy into the contest, and after all to merely destroy, and to build up nothing in the place of that which was gone. Paracelsus introduced into chemistry the spirit of scepticism. His first public professional act was to burn publicly the writings of Galen and Avicenna, and, curiously enough, he first commenced the discontinuance of the use of the learned languages in teaching, and substituted the vernacular. His own beard, he said, contained more knowledge than all the universities, and the hairs of his head more than that of all previous physicians. As if to keep up the parallel with Luther, Paracelsus was, although like Luther essentially a Pyrrhonist, excessively superstitious upon many points, and believed, or affected to believe, in the doctrine of signatures, and other fancies as absurd. Paracelsus closed his troubled and vagabond life in 1541.

In one sense Paracelsus inflicted a severe blow upon the science of chemistry, but indirectly, and ultimately, he certainly promoted its progress. To attack what is believed, possibly believed with affection, simply because it is established belief, and the preaching up of empiricism are always dangerous enough, but in this, as in other analogous cases, out of danger comes safety. The superstitious and otherwise absurd doctrines of Paracelsus and his (happily, few) followers, were soon neglected and forgotten, but the faith in the efficacy of mineral or chemical remedies, as they came to be called, in opposition to the Galenical ones, remained, and what was of more importance still, (for a great many mineral drugs might, after all, safely be dispensed with,) chemistry became to be recognized as an essential branch of medical education, and from this time every physician was more or less of a chemist, a procedure that has subsequently brought about very beneficial results.

The purely empirical school of Paracelsus speedily and naturally died. We say *naturally*, for empiricism being the product of an individual, dies with the individual. But chemistry had received such a shock from her encounter with these practical innovations, that the dogmatic school did not at once assume its sway, but methodism again obtained the supremacy. Van Helmont was the founder of this new methodic sect. Born in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, he studied philosophy at Louvain, and there attended the prelections of the Jesuits of that city, but he took no degree. He became next a diligent student of the writings of Thomas à Kempis and of Taulerus, and he endeavoured to draw an analogy between physical science and the operations of divine grace. From a spirit of mortification he surrendered his property to his sister, studied medicine in order that he might be of use to the poor, and endeavoured to build up a system of general material philosophy, including, of course, chemistry.

This system was not that of a rational dogmatist, but essentially methodic, and therefore its details need not detain us long. He assumed the existence of an imaginary principle, which he named the archæus, and which he maintained had some mysterious power of drawing the particles of matter together by means of the process of fermentation. Only two causes of matter, he said, existed,

the cause *per quam*, or the archæus, and the cause *ex qua*, which he maintained was water. Even existing botanical works sometimes quote Van Helmont's experiment with the willow, which he imagined, of course quite erroneously, to obtain its wood, leaves, bark, &c., entirely from that fluid. The archæus he maintained was nearly analogous to the soul, and by the ferment that it produced the particles of water were so variously arranged as to produce every material form and structure. The manner in which Van Helmont explained details by means of his theory need not be here stated, and are only interesting to the scientific antiquarian. He founded, however, the school of iatro-chemistry, among the members of which we may mention our own Willis, the anatomist. This sect, essentially a methodic, and therefore of course a wrong one, held the preposterous notion that all the operations in the living body depended entirely upon non-vital or upon chemical and mechanical properties, and could be explained by and were analogous with the mere properties of dead matter. Nevertheless, for a considerable time all the physicians were more or less iatro-chemists. To this day in medical language, or, at any rate, in popular medical language, many expressions remain that have been clearly derived from this sect.

Properly speaking, it was Boerhaave, the great medical dogmatist, who put down this methodic school of iatro-chemists, although several movements in this direction had unquestionably been made before the publication of his work upon chemistry. This reform was effected by Boerhaave, not by rejecting theory, but by returning to the old plan of rational dogmatism. Some of his experiments, as those having reference to the impossibility of fixing mercury, were most elaborate, and extended over a period of fifteen years. Boerhaave, however, cannot be said to have added anything to chemistry, so much as to have restored it to its orthodox form. Among the members of his school, some of whom, in point of fact, really preceded him, but who did not attain to his authority, may be named Glauber, Lemery, Kunckel, and Geoffroy.

We must now go chronologically backwards. Towards the close of the seventeenth century Mr. Mayow of Oxford expressed his belief that there was a connection between combustion and respiration. He ascertained experimentally that air in a glass, in which a candle had been

burned, could no longer support combustion, and that an animal introduced into it died. Some time afterwards the subject of combustion excited the attention of Stahl, and he and his school founded the famous phlogiston theory. The original founder, indeed, of this very ingenious theory was certainly Beecher, but Stahl so refined upon it that he is entitled to be regarded as its founder. All combustible bodies, he taught, were compound ones, and during combustion one of the constituents was dissipated, while the other remained behind. Thus, when a metal was burnt, and a calx (or oxide) obtained, it was held that the metal, before being burnt, had been a compound, that in the burning it had parted with one of its constituents, (which received the name of phlogiston,) and, farther, that if the phlogiston could be restored to it, (the calx,) the original metal could be obtained. It will be observed that the constituent supposed to be expelled from combustibles during combustion was considered to be the same, namely, phlogiston in all combustibles.

We know now that this theory was not only imperfect but erroneous, but we perhaps do not sufficiently appreciate its beauty and its usefulness. And certainly it accorded exactly with all known chemical facts. For instance, if we take lead and expose it to a red heat, red lead as we call it, or lead calx, as it was called, is formed. Stahl's explanation of this was, that lead was a compound of lead, calx, and phlogiston, and that the latter had been by the heat expelled. If this calx be heated with charcoal, or any other combustible substance, we get metallic lead again. Stahl explained this by saying that the calx had acquired phlogiston from the combustible. We know that lead, when heated, becomes a calx or oxide, by obtaining oxygen from the air, and that the calx becomes a metal again from its oxygen combining with the carbon of the combustible. Our space does not permit us to give other illustrations, but it will be plain from what has been stated, how admirably the phlogiston theory explained an immense number of chemical phenomena.

The error committed by Stahl and his school was in not using the balance. When the lead was heated, if it parted with phlogiston to become a calx, it would of course become lighter, but the fact is the very reverse. On the other hand, if when the calx became metal again, it did so by obtaining phlogiston from the combustible, it would

become heavier, but it actually loses. And, in fact, as we shall immediately have occasion to notice, it was the balance that destroyed the phlogiston theory. The theory, however, did in its time good, was taught by eminent men, and was relinquished whenever disproved. It was a step in rational chemistry.

Our space forbids us to mention any one who kept up the credit of the Stahlian school, save that of Charnier, whose *Elements of Chemistry* was long the standard text book, and the English translation was for long recommended by Dr. Black, who, about a century ago, made a discovery that was the first step in the foundation of the new rational school. It had long been known that when chalk, a solid substance, is heated to redness, it becomes very acrid. The explanation given of this was, that the chalk had acquired phlogiston, but Black ascertained that the change was owing to the fixed air, as carbonic acid gas was then called, being driven off. When, to the other alkalies carbonate lime was added, it was thought that the lime communicated causticity, but Black proved most satisfactorily that the real action that took place was, that the lime removed from them the carbonic acid, and which carbonic acid had prevented their properties from being developed. It is impossible to overrate the importance of this new doctrine of chemistry. Continuing his investigations regarding heat, Black developed his theory of latent heat, which certainly has been the parent of the steam engine. Black farther ascertained with regard to carbonic acid, that it would not support either combustion or respiration, that it was formed in the lungs of animals, and was also a product of fermentation.

Before the time of Black chemists had known that aeriform matter was often evolved from substance, but such were always considered to have the composition of air, and indeed to be that fluid. Black had, however, established the existence of fixed air, or carbonic acid. The properties of this were still more fully investigated by Cavendish, who likewise discovered the existence of a third separate gas, inflammable air, or as we now call it, hydrogen. Cavendish, for a very probable reason, the fallacy of which we cannot here enter into, was inclined to regard hydrogen as phlogiston. A little later, Rutherford of Edinburgh discovered the existence of another gas,

nitrogen, or mephitic air, as it was then named. The school of the pneumatic chemists was founded.

The greatest ornament of this school was unquestionably Priestley. His first discovery was that of nitrous acid, or at any rate he first attended to the properties of this gaseous compound, and employed it in the analysis of air. On the 1st August, 1744, he discovered oxygen, or diphlogisticated air, as it was termed. The reason that Priestley adopted this expression was, that he believed in the phlogiston theory, and seeing that the oxygen obtained from the air supported combustion so readily; he inferred that it had been deprived of its phlogiston, and that the cause of its supporting combustion so brilliantly, was owing to its great tendency to combine again with phlogiston. Dr. Priestley likewise first made known sulphurous acid, hydrochloric acid, ammoniacal gas, and other substances, and moreover, he was the first who pointed out that the fixed air, or carbonic acid that was the product either of combustion or respiration, was removed from the atmosphere by plants that actually obtained nutriment from it.

We cannot pass over this school of chemistry without a notice at least of Scheele and Bergmann. The former certainly discovered oxygen quite independently of any knowledge that he had of what Priestley had done, and the Essay on "Elective Attractions" of the latter, was the most successful piece of philosophical generalization of his age. He demonstrated that all bodies that can chemically unite together, have a fixed and definite attraction for one another,—that one substance has various degrees of affinity for various substances, and that even when united to one for which it has a slight affinity, if a substance be presented to it for which it has a stronger affinity, decomposition takes place, and a new compound is formed. This doctrine has been a little modified, but is nevertheless the basis of all inorganic chemical philosophy.

Next came the French school, but their additions to chemical science, as well as those of their successors, demand, and shall obtain a separate review. One observation may here be allowed. The number of chemical facts that have accumulated has been, since the era of Lavoisier, so great, that there is again some little fear of both empiricism and methodism attacking chemistry. It

may seem paradoxical to say it, but perhaps the greatest blessing that could fall on modern chemistry would be, if it did not receive one solitary additional fact for the next dozen years. As too much food, instead of nourishing, produces disease, so the too eager research for, and too rapid recording of facts and detailed observations, produce a morbid state in science. Facts, indeed, only are of use in so far as principles may be deduced from them. And at present chemistry has a great many statements that are not quite certain, and a great lack of the generalization of its clearly established facts. When this is the case, history tells us that there is a great tendency to despise slow and rational deduction, and to fly off into methodical theories, and empirical practices. Chemistry is now perhaps in some danger of both, for much undoubtedly remains to be learned regarding the composition of compound bodies, and perhaps the number of the elementary ones, or so-called elementary ones, to be reduced. In the hands of a Faraday, allotropism will be philosophical, yet, if it fall into the hands of some, it may become merely a representation of the methodic alchemy of the Arabs. Empiricism, too, has of late years made some fierce assaults upon chemistry. The mere laboratorians, who live among retorts and furnaces, and who are dexterous at manipulating, and at repeating often before performed analyses, are becoming very much disposed to consider themselves as the chemical philosophers. The work-people in fact not only despise, but wish to depose their masters, and like the bellows-blower to Handel's organ, affirm that it is they who make the harmony. However, if chemistry has before it some little dangers, it has had many much more serious ere now, and has not only escaped from them, but has carried away spoil, and so doubtless will chemistry do again.

ART. IV.—1. *The Natural History of Creation.* By T. LINDLEY KEMP. London: Longmans, 1852.

2. *Indications of Instinct.* By T. LINDLEY KEMP; being Nos. 24 and 54 of the "Traveller's Library." London: Longmans, 1854.

THESE two little books, by the same author, are popular expositions of not a few topics of the highest interest and importance. Dr. Kemp has successfully studied the art of popular writing on subjects of science. This is no small praise, for the greatest number of our modern popular scientific treatises are composed in a manner not at all level to the apprehension of the parties for whose use such books are intended. Many of these are meagre enough as respects the amount of knowledge which they convey, yet full of details as far as they go. But details, however important, should hold but a secondary place in a popular treatise, while the main attention should be devoted to supplying the reader with ideas, so as to enable him to enter into the spirit of the subject under consideration, and to make way for his easier apprehension of the purpose and bearing of the details. It is true that the English mind, owing to its decidedly practical turn, seeks details, and hardly feels that it is acquiring knowledge while nothing but general views and principles are communicated. And this, doubtless, is the reason why so many treatises which have "popular" printed on the title-page, exhibit so little of a popular character in their interior. The authors indulge the national humour, and fill their books with particulars, but with what result? certainly with no success in spreading through new circles of society the knowledge of the subjects which they have undertaken to teach. Their readers can see that, according to the standard of ample detail, the books are excellent, but they come to the conclusion that such studies are either not suited to the meagreness of their present ideas, or to the stinted leisure which they can command from their habitual avocations. If, then, any great progress is hereafter to be made in imparting to the general public a knowledge of scientific subjects, a change of plan must be made in our popular

treatises—the public taste for the appearance of particulars must not be indulged, but counteracted, while means must be found of reconciling people to the cultivation of general notions, ideas, and principles, in the various branches of scientific research, as preliminary to the attainment of a better facility for the apprehension and remembrance of the particulars of the sciences.

“The Natural History of Creation,” the first of the works at the head of this article, is a duodecimo of 123 pages. It is designed to exhibit the general character of the three great departments of nature, the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms, the modes in which these are connected together, and the plan on which the existence of the two organic kingdoms is developed and maintained. The treatise is wholly elementary, and throughout most intelligible. The titles of the two first chapters are, “The living and the dead occupants of the globe,” and “The way the blood is circulated;” those of the two last are, “The way people die,” and “The ways the doctors have of preventing death.”

The second of the two works, namely, “Indications of Instinct,” is a duodecimo of 144 pages. Of this we wish to speak a little more fully.

Dr. Kemp gives a large extension to the idea of instinct. He regards instinct as belonging not merely to the higher orders of animals, but as displayed in the acts of the very lowest tribes of the animal kingdom, and even in the vegetable creation. Nevertheless, if we understand our author aright, he limits the operations of instinct to what physiologists term relative acts, that is, to acts by which the organic system establishes direct relations with things without, exclusive of the acts immediately subservient to its own proper development and maintenance. Such relative acts are commonly regarded as peculiar to animals, and were indeed formerly known distinctively as the animal functions, the attributes by which animals are in particular distinguished from vegetables. It is undeniable that the functions, namely, the operations of sense and voluntary motion, by which the higher animals, and man in particular, acquire a knowledge of nature, and a power over it, are essentially the attributes of the animal kingdom; nevertheless, these functions dwindle to a minimum in the lowest tribes of animals, and are replaced in plants by acts which, though manifestly different in their physiolo-

gical character, are yet often strictly analogous in their effects. Thus, when a man gathers dates from a date-palm, he performs an act of relation; he exerts a power over nature; but when these dates, received into his stomach, undergo digestion, and pass into chyme, the act is termed physiologically an organic or vegetative act, and falls under that class of functions which is common to all organic nature, to plants as well as to animals. But to take an example from the work before us. The bean contains a large proportion of alkali, and a small proportion of siliceous earth, while barley contains a large proportion of a siliceous earth, and a small proportion of alkali, and the roots of these two plants spread out in the same field till each has obtained the requisite quantity of these two elements. It is true the acts in these contrasted instances of the animal and vegetable kingdom differ essentially in the organization by which they are severally effected, but in their general result there is a strict analogy, so that it does not seem unreasonable to admit this extension of the radicles of such plants as the bean and barley to the rank of relative functions.

When, then, our author admits certain operations of plants to the rank of instincts, it is to be understood that such operations uniformly bear a strict analogy to what are termed the relative acts of animals. He does not, in short, destroy the use of the term instinct, as some have done, not without plausible reasons, when they have considered all the operations of organic nature as bearing one character of instinctive acts—speaking even of the chemical phenomena exhibited in the development and repair of living structures as the results of instinctive affinities. In such an excessive extension of the term instinct, it becomes confounded with the operations of vitality. We admit, however, that such a view has a foundation in the strict analogy which exists between the results produced by the operations of the molecular constituents of the solids and fluids of living nature, so strongly suggestive of the direct presence of an intelligent agency, and those wonderful performances determined in animals by that inward impulse to which ordinarily the name of instinct is applied.

Among the instances of instinct in plants, Dr. Kemp enumerates the opening and shutting of flowers; the movements of the stamens in certain flowers, by which the

pollen is communicated to the stigma, the change in the direction of the leaves in many plants, as in what is termed the sleep of plants, one of the ordinary effects of which is, to conceal and protect the flowers; also the singular effects witnessed in the *Dionæa muscipula*, or Venus' fly-trap, in the several species of *Drosera*, or sun-dew; the species of *Oscillatoria* among the jointed algæ, the phenomena of climbing plants, and the acts already referred to by which many plants extend their radicles along the adjacent soil till the proper kind of food is attained. Viewed as relative acts, that is, as acts falling under the same head as the acts of knowledge and power exemplified in the higher animals, such phenomena have plainly a rudimentary character; still, they are more allied to relative phenomena than to those direct acts of assimilation, which, under the guidance of a vital chemistry, are performed in the ultimate cells of the vegetable texture. Hence, if all the functions of organic nature, both vegetable and animal, be exhausted under the three heads, vegetative, reproductive, and relative, the above enumerated phenomena of the vegetable kingdom must necessarily fall under the head of relative phenomena, and, therefore, claim a place under instinct as justly as any analogous phenomena in the animal kingdom. They are acts of a rudimentary relative character, essential to some required use in the economy of the plants which exhibit them, and determined by the presence or by the more or less frequent recurrence of an adequate stimulant agency.

Among the instances of instinct referred to by our author in the lowest tribes of animals, are the following:—Some of the infusories, animals so minute that hundreds of thousands of them may exist in a single drop of water, rotate the bristles or tenacles around their mouths, by which a current of water, containing their food, is determined into their mouths; polypes fix themselves to rocks less exposed to violent currents, and apparently, if there be a deficiency of light in their first place of abode, they move towards a lighter place of abode, and when they seize their food, they put out no more of their long arms than is necessary to overpower their present prey; the coral polypes, after having reared an island above the surface of the sea, with a lake in its centre, leave a communication between this lake and the sea, by which a due supply of food and building materials may enter; the sea-

anemones present at times the appearance of expanded flowers, fixed to rocks at the bottom of the sea, and when all is quiet these apparent flowers come up to the surface, but on the slightest indication of danger, instantly descend, and nothing is there to be seen but a fleshy mass, sticking so fast to the rocky bottom, that it cannot be removed without tearing its structure to pieces; the young salpes, whose structure is frail, like that of a thin jelly, unite themselves together for mutual protection, by means of lateral suckers, and when after a time a greater stability of structure is attained, the instinct of association ceases, and the several individuals separate; these salpes being the lowest animals in point of organization, which possess the instinct of association for mutual support; the pholads, or stone-borers, little animals living in a fragile bivalve shell, bore a hole after a definite plan, in the hard rock, which may serve them for a habitation; among the bivalve shells, such as the oyster, the clam, and those of the genus *venus* to which the wampum belongs, singular instincts are observed, as for example, that by which the oyster, by suddenly squirting out water, throws its enemy, the crab, on its back, and those by which some of the others use one of their shells as a sail, when at the surface, in a gentle breeze; the remarkably complex movements, by which the common garden snail prepares in autumn for hibernation, the chief object of which is, to provide a supply of air for its respiration during the time occupied, on the return of spring, in working itself out of its winter prison; the condylope, termed the pest of the perch, the hermit-crab, the genus crab in general, and the spider tribe, with their generally known singular instinctive habits, conclude this interesting chapter.

The next chapter is devoted to the instinct of insects, in which much attractive matter is added, to what is so generally known on this subject, the singular habits of ants and bees affording the principal themes of the chapter.

In the next chapter, on the instinct of fishes and reptiles, many curious facts are related. Among others we find a notice of the fish termed the fly-shooter, which the Chinese often keep for amusement in their houses, the singularity in its habits being the accuracy with which it darts a drop of water at such insects as come within reach, so as to kill or stun them for prey. Again, a notice of the

fishing-frog, which conceals itself in the sea-weeds, while the filaments fringing its body float and move about like worms, so as to attract fishes, which are immediately swallowed by the greedy monster.

The chapter on the instincts of birds is short—along, however, with other interesting matter, it contains an account of the singular instinct of the young cuckoo, by which it ejects the young of the bird, into the nest of which, when still an egg, it had been dropped by the equally striking instinct of its parent,—the remarkable adaptation in the form of the young cuckoo for this instinctive piece of injustice, as first pointed out to the Royal Society by the illustrious Jenner, is not omitted.

In the chapter on the instincts of mammals, our author points out how much less forcible is the impulse in these towards such acts than in the lower animals, as evinced by the comparative facility with which the instinctive habits of mammals are changed and counteracted by circumstances.

A chapter follows on the reasoning powers of animals. Under this head our author gives as an example of reasoning power in animals, not very high in the scale, a statement as to the black ants of India, made by Colonel Sykes. To protect his dessert, consisting of fruit, cake, and preserves, from these ants, the legs of the table, on which it stood before it was required, were first placed in pails of water—this was effectual for a time, but ere long the ants braved the water, plunging in, and scrambling to one of the legs of the table,—the legs of the table were now painted with a circle of turpentine, which, it appears they could not cross: nevertheless, in a few days it was found that they had gained access to the table in as great numbers as before, which feat they had accomplished by creeping up the wall, so as to reach the ceiling immediately over the table, and then dropping down on the dainties they so much coveted. This last expedient Dr. Kemp regards as decidedly the result of a process of reasoning.

Our author at last comes to discourse of man, and here we shall allow him to speak for himself.

“Man is indeed devoid of instincts; and his reason, if indeed it be of the same nature as that of the higher beasts, is as superior in its results as the instinct of the bee is to the instinctive

turning of the plant to light. But, besides his corporal connexion, and his exalted power of reasoning upon external objects, he has something additional. When external objects are presented to his senses, he does not instinctively act in some particular manner as the beasts do ; but he observes and reflects, and acts in accordance to the decision of his mind. But although his physical actions are under the control of his intellect, some of his mental operations are of a nature analogous to the corporeal instincts of animals. As when the first ray of light discloses to the young water-bird, or the young crocodile, the water, each of these makes for that element ; so, when certain propositions—propositions, too, that have no connection with matter—are made to man, his mind or spiritual part at once believes them, and adopts them as part of its own being.”—p. 138.

To this quotation we shall add the concluding paragraph of the work, which, in a few words, shows the scope and tendency of the argument throughout both these excellent little books.

“ This, then, is the argument. Ages ago it pleased an all-powerful Being to call into existence this matter that is cognizable by our senses. What endowments He at first conferred upon it, it is impossible to discover ; but at one period He made it subject to the laws of gravitation, to which laws a great portion of it is still liable. Subsequently, He bestowed upon the different elements of it those extraordinary chemical affinities which, after a study of nature for two thousand years, man is now beginning to discern, and which chemical affinities still regulate the greater part of the unions which yet occur. After this, it would seem to have been part of His will to make various portions of matter unite, so as to form organized beings, subject to the laws of vitality and instinct. When we come to the higher of these we behold the operation of a new element—reason, which is supplementary to instinct in producing and causing motion. Then, leaving the animals, we come to a new being, man, connected in some mysterious manner with matter, but who is not under the control of instinct, but of reason, not only physical movements, but mental abstractions ; and who, moreover, instinctively believes, when told, in God and another state of being. And as we see in merely vitalized beings, that the instinctive desire to attain an end invariably concludes in that end being attained, so also, the instinctive beliefs of man will unquestionably be realised. That this will be so, may be learned from another and a higher source, but still it is the legitimate deduction from the study of that physical science which is so often thought to oppose revelation, and is from time to time set up to oppose it. And thus it is that from apparent darkness proceeds light, that faith springs out of doubt, and that, to use the words of the old Hebrew warrior, ‘ out of the eater there came forth meat.’—pp. 143-144.

ART. V.—*The Druses of the Lebanon. Their Manners, Customs, and History.* With a translation of their Religious Code. By GEORGE WASHINGTON CHASSEAUD, late of Beyrout, Syria. London : Bentley, 1855.

A VOLUME realizing the promise of such a title would command no vulgar interest, especially from a writer whose opportunities of observation and study were so considerable as those which appear to have been enjoyed by Mr. Chasseaud. But we are sorry that we cannot say that M. Chasseaud has been equal to his opportunities. He has undoubtedly given us a certain insight into the customs of those extraordinary tribes, and some of his pictures are not altogether wanting in colour and animation ; his version, too, of their religious and moral system is sufficiently interesting, but the two or three dozen pages which he devotes to their history, are a bad title on which to found a claim to be called a historian of the Druses. In truth, his pretensions are more modest in the text than in the title ; for in the former he claims only to have given “ a brief historical sketch ;” but unless the responsibility of the title can be shifted upon the publishers ; the author has sent out his book in a character which it cannot sustain. The sketch, such as it is, while it deals chiefly with matters of secondary interest, and touches upon the many theories that perplex our inquiry into the origin of the Druses ; scarcely at all notices the struggles between them and the Maronites, which have contributed more, perhaps, to make them known to Europe, than any other occurrence in their history, worthy as that history is of being studied for the singular characteristics of religion and government it discloses, and the curious theories involved in its origin.

The most hopeful feature, as it occurs to us, in Mr. Chasseaud's book, is the youthfulness of the style, from which we are inclined to infer, though perhaps without sufficient warrant, the youth of the author. If we are right in supposing him to be of unripe years, a good many of his faults of style will be accounted for ; and, as a specimen of precocity, the book may be considered fair enough,

Time, reading, and experience, have an irresistible tendency to confine a man to statements of fact, and prune down his redundant imagination. To borrow our author's style, this faculty of his, as might be expected, runs riot most freely in the field of description. In mere narrative he is more staid, natural, and it need scarcely be added, far more pleasing; although even there we meet with somewhat startling juvenilities. A Druse peasant, for instance, is made to give the history of his courtship, and cannot get through it without telling us that "the course of true love never did run smooth," an evidence of familiarity with English literature, that must be rare, to say the least of it, among the Druses. There are, nevertheless, a good many interesting, and, we have no doubt, faithful pictures of Druse life and manners in the book, and had its title been less pretentious, these imperfections of style, to which we have thought it necessary to allude, would not have been so conspicuous.

Beyond a few opinions modestly ventured as to the descent of the Druses from the ancient Hivites, and some snatches of their modern annals, there is not much information of an historical kind to be derived from the volume. As we before observed, their struggle with the Maronites is only once or twice noticed, and that incidentally; but who the Maronites are we are left to our own research to discover. With regard to the peculiar doctrines, however, of the Druses, doctrines so very different from any professed elsewhere, we have not so much reason to complain. They are noticed in the course of the sketches: and the Appendix, from which we propose to make an extract or two, contains what purports to be the exact system both of belief and morals adopted by the Druses. Eccentric as this symbol may appear, and crowded as it is with absurdities, a closer inspection will show that its principal features, though at present to be found only amongst the Druses, were by no means confined to these tribes, or even originated by them. They are extinct monsters of imagination for the bulk of mankind, but they had, even amongst men claiming to be Christians, as real an existence as the Megalosaurus had in the material world. In a word, the creed or the mysteries of the Druses are plainly an offshoot of the ancient Gnosticism, and the result of a precisely similar grafting of eastern myths, and what has been called eastern philosophy, upon the truths

of Revelation. This will appear with sufficient clearness when we come to place the matters of comparison in juxtaposition; and a little inquiry will enable us, moreover, to ascertain with tolerable accuracy the period when the Druse doctrines began to grow into their present shape, though we cannot pretend to carry our speculation so far back as the patriarchal times.

We believe it will be found that the history proper of the Druses begins about the period of the Mahometan Schism between the literal and figurative expounders of the Koran. Their history, as a distinct nationality, commences at that epoch, because it is just then we meet with the originators of their religious system. It is hardly necessary to say they began with the figurative interpretation of the Koran, for, grotesque as is the compilation of that celebrated book, its letter could never lend itself even remotely to a construction resembling the creed of the Druses. Their doctrines, in a crude state of course, were first made public in Cairo, by two leaders of the figurative school, Mahommed, son of Ismael, surnamed Darusi, and Hamsa, son of Ali, surnamed Al Hadi, or the leader. It was not to be supposed that opinions like theirs could establish themselves without opposition, or indeed, establish themselves at all in a large community; and accordingly we find the coryphæi of the new doctrines obliged to escape from Cairo, and take refuge in the mountains. They had, however, made some proselytes, and one in particular, of great importance—Hakem, formerly the caliph of the family of Ali. They taught him that he was no less a personage than the incarnation of the Deity, and freely applied to him all the epithets that in the Koran are applied to God alone. Whether he allowed his head to be turned by their adulation, or simply lent himself to the imposture, certain it is, a total change was wrought in his character. From being a zealous upholder of the law, and a stern persecutor of Jews and Christians, he threw the law overboard, and allowed the infidels to live unmolested. When Hamsa was obliged to withdraw from Cairo, and seek in the Lebanon that hospitality which is probably of earlier date than the religion of the Druses, Hakem supplied him with money, which Hamsa paid back in incense, and published his mysteries from the unapproachable secrecy and security of the mountains. This was quite a congenial spot for the growth of gnosticism in any

of its varieties. Basilides was anxious in his own day to establish the five years' probationary silence of Pythagoras; though, indeed, the gnostics have not been peculiar in affecting secrecy and mystery, at least until their extravagancies were ripe for publicity. It was the same with the Albigenses, who, however, were a slip of the parent stock, and later still, with the first Jansenists, whose well-known motto was, "occulte propter metum Judæorum." But the apotheosis of Hakem could not be complete before his death; for it was hard to persuade men that another living and moving man, with whom they were in daily intercourse, was a mere phantasm, as they declared Hakem to be; a farther point of similarity between them, and we believe, all varieties of Gnostics, who believed that the Redeemer never was born, and never suffered in the flesh; but that he was a mere manifestation of the Deity to corporeal eyes, having no real or substantial existence. The appearance of Hakem, in the year 375, of the Hegyra and his enthronization in 386, were, as Hampsa taught, after the death of Hakem, mere visions for the purpose of giving men some idea of the Creator. Regarding God himself, it was held that He could not be described by attributes—you were forbidden to compare Him with anything earthly, and it was equally unlawful to speak of Him in the negative. The spirits immediately next in rank to God were five, Mind, Soul, Word, Precursor, and Follower. The five were parts of a whole, just as in the taper the wax, wick, flame, and stand, constitute the entire. The flame, Hampsa added, is at first of a bluish red, soon seen, and soon disappearing—symbolical of Hampsa himself, who, though he assigned to Hakem the first place in his system, seems to have reserved the most important one for his own especial gratification. Accordingly, it is from the incarnation of "Mind," in Hampsa, rather than from any of the events in the life of Hakem that the Druse epoch dates. He is styled the first cause of causes, the unique teacher who instructs the whole world,—who exalts and humbles all the other ranks of spirits,—the hand of time, the one possessor of argument,—nay, the title of Allah itself is not withheld from him.

This body of doctrine with a moral code not altogether so absurd, is committed to the charge of certain ministers called Akals, the precise nature of whose functions, or anything beyond their great influence over the people, it is not

easy to determine. Most probably the isolation of the Druses in religion, as well as their mountain fastnesses, contributed to secure their independence for so many centuries, as the same causes secured that of their neighbours, the Maronites, for a period almost equally long: and both these nations, though so different in religious profession, and both so warlike, lived in wonderfully good intelligence, and often brotherhood in arms, until Europe and Asia conspired to embroil them, and gave rise to scenes of blood and desolation such as even Palestine has rarely witnessed.

The Maronites, whose name and origin as a religious body appears involved in almost as great obscurity as that of the Druses, ought to command a relative interest at least, in any historian of the latter, or even in any one writing a book about them. We of course feel no ordinary interest in one of the few oriental churches of our own communion. We could gladly discuss the rival theories regarding their early errors and the time of their final reunion with the Roman Church, were they our peculiar concern at this moment; but this much is certain, that whatever may have been their errors at a remote period, their union with the Church at the present day is so complete and intimate, that learned Maronites, with pardonable zeal for the good name of their ancestors, have ingeniously laboured to prove that there was no real difference of opinion between Rome and the Maronites in matters of doctrine. And it struck us as something very strange, that Mr. Chasseaud was so destitute of even the ordinary inquisitiveness of Englishmen, as not to discover in his visit to the convent of Daer al Shafi that it is the residence of a Patriarch of Antioch, who has seventeen suffragans in the Lebanon, who takes the name of Peter, is in communion with Rome, and governs a Church so interestingly primitive in ritual, discipline, and observances, though perhaps a Protestant might not be willing to allow it primitive belief.

We extract a rather pleasing description of the preliminaries to a Druse marriage.

“ When these preliminaries have been arranged, then three days before the time fixed for the celebration of the wedding, the young man assembles together all the youths of the village, and picking out of these the finest and handsomest looking men, makes them

arm themselves cap-à-pie, and himself a perfect armoury of warlike weapons, heading them, he proceeds in a regular procession to the house of the father of his future bride, who, on his side having duly received intimation of the fact, arms himself and his household also, and stands at the threshold of the door to receive him, demanding in words similar to Scott's celebrated song—

‘ Oh come ye in peace here or come ye in war,
Or to dance at our bridal young Lord Lochnivar ? ’

Here, in presence of the assembled villagers, and after loud discussion, the final articles of the marriage are settled and agreed to; the bride's father who possesses some portion of that love of gain inherent amongst Eastern nations, usually adds a few piastres or a sheep or two to what was originally contemplated in the valuation of the bride.

“ But the young man who is impatient to obtain the final consent, and who, moreover, remembers that ‘nunkey pays for me,’ that his father will bear the cost of expenses, usually agrees to the compact; it is then agreed as a secondary matter of consideration what dowry is to be settled by the young man upon the bride herself; but this is merely a fictitious arrangement, for such a thing as pin-money is unknown amongst Druse married ladies.

“ This point adjusted, the young man solemnly declares, and promises to the family to protect and love his future wife; then the betrothed girl, veiled from head to foot and accompanied by her nearest female relations, is brought to the door, and her lover asks her in a distinct voice, that all-important question which settles the destinies of so many poor mortals upon earth. As a matter of course the girl replies in the affirmative, but at the same time she presents him in token of her future obedience with a dagger carefully drawn up in a woollen scarf of her own manufacture, and which she has many days, nay, years, previously knitted, inch by inch, as she pictured up in her childish imagination the realisation of this happy hour when the bold lover should come to ask her for this token. It is to be hoped that the husband may never have occasion to unrip the threads which conceal this sharp-edged tool from sight, for among the Druses it is supposed that he will only resort to it in order to protect his wife from some murderous assault, or to satiate the hateful passion of jealousy. * * *

“ At last the auspicious morning for the celebration of the marriage arrives. Stout preparations are early on foot at the house of the bridegroom; women are busy washing up and scrubbing the floor, and arranging mats, cushions, etc., against the reception of the expected guests, and those guests are supposed to consist of all and every one who may choose to present themselves to partake of the hospitality or join in the revelry, it being always understood that these people do make their appearance in their

best holiday attire, and this seems to have been a custom prevalent ever since the days of our Saviour, all over the Holy Land and Syria. As in the parable the guest who presented himself at the wedding feast without a wedding garment was instantly cast out and expelled, so at the present day it would be looked upon and resented as an insult if any labourer made his appearance without donning his best holiday attire.

“Then, again, in apt illustration of another parable, it is still the duty of the Lord of the feast to assign to those who honour him with their presence, a position in his house, or a seat in his divan, according to their respective claims to consideration. Thus in the outer courts are invariably to be encountered the poorer classes of inhabitants, all served with equal liberality and profusion, but none permitted to enter into the precincts of the house itself, unless it be on servile errands; while in the interior, those admissible to distinction are ranged with particular care and precision along the room, the most honourable guests being seated at the top, and near the master of the house himself, and those of least pretension nearest to the door of entry.”—Pp. 148—153.

The following description of the order of Akals is not a little flattering to those “holy persons,” as Mr. Chasseaud appears to consider them. We believe there must be a certain amount of truth in it, and we hope for their sakes the truth is the predominating element.

“The class of Akals is not necessarily restricted to the male population; women are often admitted, provided they are of a certain age, and are prepared to submit themselves to the same system of self-denial which characterises the men. The following is the course of proceeding which is adopted when a person is desirous of joining the order. A necessary preliminary is, the person who is a candidate for the honour of admission into the sacred corps, should intimate his intention to an Akal, upon which a meeting is held. This is a very solemn affair, and the ordeal one of the strictest imaginable. An enquiry takes place into the general character and conduct of the aspirant—his whole life is passed in review, his habits criticised, and everything that is known respecting him fully discussed.

“Supposing him not to be guilty of any crime, and to be well recommended, the next step is that he should be made acquainted with the requisitions of the Druse religion, which are then set before him, and he is informed that in order to be worthy of becoming an Akal, he must forthwith abandon every vice, and relinquish all the idle habits he may hitherto have indulged in. He must not smoke nor drink wine nor spirits; neither must he take snuff; he must be content to wear the plainest apparel (this was perhaps aimed at the fairer portion of Akal society), and in short, laying aside every thought of splendour and luxury, must only consider how he can

best show in his demeanour and life, a firm devotion to the simple habits and sacred principles of the order of which he now desires to become an adopted member.

“But this is not enough : the capability to lead a holy life is not always equal to the desire. A temporary excitement of religious tendencies, a more than ordinary warmth of imagination, a sudden calamity may for a time awaken the stings of conscience, and affect the tenderest sensibilities of the heart, but the good impressions too often yield before the force of temptation, and the dormant energies which have been roused for the moment, sink back into their wonted lethargy, or a zeal untempered by knowledge proves that we have undertaken a burthen too heavy to bear, and that we had better not have put our hand to the plough if we cannot forbear to look back.

“The wise Akals, therefore, are not satisfied with the test of promises, they require a little proof, and to this end they allow the candidate for admission into their ranks a certain fixed period, varying in duration according to the man's previous life, before the lapse of which he is expected to have made up his mind fully as to his capability of conforming faithfully for the rest of his life to the tenets of so strict and severe a profession. During this period of probation, all his actions and pursuits are closely watched, and scrupulously noted ; and should he at the end of this allotted term still evince a desire to become an Akal, he is then admitted into the Kaloue, and suffered to attend some of their religious meetings and listen to an exposition of their creed and doctrines. Twelve months are now devoted to his religious education, at the end of which he is considered sufficiently tried and instructed to assume the title of Akal. Then the ceremony of donning the white turban takes place, for by this white turban the Akals are recognised, and he is thereupon admitted into all the mysteries of the faith, and becomes one of the initiated brethren.

“Although almost all of what are commonly called the pleasures of life are denied to these holy men, yet celibacy is not enjoined upon the sect. An Akal may marry if he pleases, but it is not often that he does so, especially among the Druses. The Akals of that tribe are, generally speaking, anxious to detach themselves as much as possible from the ordinary pursuits of mankind, they lead a life of the strictest devotion, passed in prayer and profound contemplation of the mysteries of religion, and are held in the highest respect and esteem for their amiable manners and virtuous lives by the whole of the people.

“They exercise, too, a very considerable influence in temporal matters, for nobody would think of entering upon any plan, or conducting an affair without consulting the Akals ; nothing of importance could be attempted, even by a Sheik, without their advice and approval ; and altogether they exercise a general controul and supervision over the manners and morals of the Druse people,

which has a most beneficial effect, for certainly as the Akals are the best of Druses, so the Druses are the best of the inhabitants of Lebanon.

“The Akals are more especially regarded as the ministers of peace ; their very presence banishes discord, and whenever a Druse peasant meets an Akal, he salutes him as one who is the harbinger of peace and happiness, and kisses his hand with reverence and affection.

“The Akals are very jealous of their Khaloues, and no European or stranger is suffered to enter them during the hour of prayer ; but at any other time they may be entered by any other sect, upon obtaining the permission of an Akal, although there is little to reward curiosity in the Khaloues, for they are very plain buildings. The walls of some of them are ornamented with different colours, and a rush mat and basin of running water are always to be found in them ; the battle flags of the tribe are also hung up there.

“As the Akals are so highly revered during life, all honour is paid to them when death summons them to another world. Upon the occasion of an Akal’s funeral, the whole village turns out and accompanies the body to the grave, and the last rites are performed with greater honours than are usually paid even at the funeral of a Sheik. Sums of money, pieces of cloth, and numerous presents, are often given by the villagers to be deposited in the grave or vault of the deceased Akal, and all the virtues and good actions which have distinguished him in life are inscribed on his tomb with affectionate fidelity.”—Pp. 376—380.

We now come to the portion of Mr. Chasseaud’s book which has been most satisfactory to us, and it is, of all others, the appendix. It contains an epitome of the mythology and morality of the Druses from native sources, being a translation of their symbol, and give evidence of that strong family likeness to the other monsters of Gnosticism which we already noticed. We shall find in these extracts the doctrine of a good and evil principle—of the world being, if not the creation of the evil spirit, at least a consequence of his existence, of its having been enacted by an inferior agency—of the unreality of the appearance and removal of Hakem, for which, in the gnostic doctrine we may substitute Christ—the transmigration of souls—the blending of the Gospel with Eastern fable and mysticism, and numerous other features common to the Druse and gnostic systems.

We need only instance a few of the extravagances of Basilides to establish at once the relationship between the Druse mysteries and his. The Father, he says, is the

origin of all things—He it was who created *Nous* or the intelligence, who in his turn produced *Λογος*, the parent of *Φρονησις*, or prudence, whose offspring was *Σοφια*, or wisdom, which last begat *Δυναμις*, or power, the Father of virtues, princes and angels, together constituting the first heaven, succeeded by other heavens, to the number of three hundred and sixty-five. The god of Jews, according to him, was a spirit of the lowest rank, and when *Nous* was dispatched by the Father in the person of Christ, it was not He that suffered crucifixion, but Simon of Cyrene. In some instances, as will be seen, the Druse doctrines are an exact copy of those of Basilides, but it seems to us made grosser and more carnal to meet the comprehension of the mountaineers.

“ A SHORT EXPLANATION OF THE OCEAN OF TIME.

“ The Creator, the supreme, created all things.

“ The first thing he created was the minister, ‘ Universal Mind,’ the praises of God be upon him ! and the Creator gave to ‘ Mind’ the power to create, classify, and arrange all things.

“ The Spirit, Mind, has the following attributes :—‘ The Virgin of Power,’ ‘ the Receiver of Revelation,’ ‘ the knower of the wishes or desires,’ ‘ the Explainer of Commands,’ ‘ the Spring of Light,’ ‘ the Will of Production,’ ‘ the Charm of the Creator,’ and so forth.

“ It was this spirit, ‘ Mind,’ known by the above attributes, that arranged the world.

“ The Mind is the pen that writes upon Stone, and the Stone which it writes upon is the ‘ Soul.’

“ The Mind is a perfect being, which being is at liberty to act, and is possessed of a free will ; all he ordains or creates is in accordance with the will of the Creator.

“ When the Creator created ‘ Mind,’ he made him possessed of a free will, and with power to separate or to remain and dwell with the Creator.

“ Ultimately, ‘ Mind’ rebelled and abandoned the Creator, and thus became the Spirit of Sin, which sin was predestined to create the Devil.

“ And the existence, or creation of the Devil, occasioned the creation of another spirit, called ‘ Universal Soul,’ and this Spirit was the cause of the Creation of all things existing.

“ The Devil is perfect sin, and the Creation of this Spirit was permitted by the Creator, to show the unlimited power of the Creator in creating a Spirit opposite to God.

“ Now, when mind rebelled against the Creator, the Creator threw him out of Heaven, but mind knew that this was done by

the Creator to test his faith, and to punish him for his sin ; so he repented, and asked forgiveness, and implored help against the devil.

“ And the Creator pitied mind, and created him a helpmate, called universal soul ; this spirit God created from the spirits of the knowledge of good and evil.

“ Then, ‘ Mind ’ told ‘ Soul ’ to yield obedience to the Creator, and ‘ Soul ’ yielded, and became a helpmate to ‘ Mind,’ and then these two spirits tried to force into submission to the ‘ Creator,’ the evil spirit, or Devil.

“ They came to the Evil one, ‘ Mind ’ from behind, and ‘ Soul ’ from before, in this fashion, to marshal the devil into the presence of the Creator ; but the Devil evaded them, being unguarded on either side, which enabled him to escape from them to the right and left.

“ The ‘ Mind ’ and ‘ Soul ’ finding this to be the case, required each of them a helpmate ; ‘ Mind ’ required a helpmate to keep the Evil one from the right side, ‘ Soul ’ one to guard him on the left, so as to hem in the devil between them, and prevent his escape on any side.

“ So they moved, and immediately two spirits were created ; the one was called ‘ Word,’ and the other ‘ Preceding.’ ”—pp. 389, 393.

Then follows a succession of those singular creations, good and evil, on the Manichæan system of opposites, the Devil, however, proves an overmatch for mind and soul, and their assistants, who, though providing for his safe custody, before, behind, and on both sides, have left him an issue upwards and downwards. The upward course gives him no escape, as bringing him to the very presence he was anxious to avoid, so he dropped downwards, or sunk into the earth, and this was the origin of hell! We next have a psychological theory, embodying the Gnostic and Pythagorean theory of the transmigration.

“ When the world was created, it was at the will of the Creator, who called it the World of Souls, and these souls are masculine or feminine.

“ All the Spirits were created from or out of ‘ Mind.’

“ The origin and root of these Spirits is the Creator ; next to him ranks ‘ Mind,’ then ‘ Soul,’ and so on in regular succession, as they were created, down to ultimum. The Souls that have been created in the world, *that is, Mankind*, were numbered from the beginning, and were never diminished or increased, and will remain so for all eternity.

“ Each Soul is perfect in itself, possessing all the senses, such as hearing, feeling, seeing, tasting, smelling, and touching, and pos-

sessing all the attributes and senses which originated by the regular successive creation of the first seven spirits, and each Spirit created possessed, in addition to its own peculiar attributes, the capacities and senses of all the others.

“All the Souls that were created in the world possessed the knowledge of all things except of the Creator, for which cause the Creator placed them in separate bodies, (*earthly tabernacles*,) and by this means they obtained knowledge of their Creator.

* * * * *

“The bodies, or encasements of these Souls, are all corruptible, but the souls themselves are incorruptible and unchangeable, shifting from one man, or beast, to another, and never differing from what they were and continue to be.”

Next succeeds a cosmogony, which, though singular enough, yet partly from its allegorical style, not unlike that of Hesiod's *Theogoneia*, has not the same freshness of absurdity discoverable in the greater part of the system, “if shape that may be called which shape has none.” Indeed, it is hardly more extravagant than, if stripped of its figurative dress, the most sober theories of ancient philosophers on the same subject. We have it, however, amply made up to us in a passage which, taken in conjunction with the pretensions of the Chinese reformer, afford a rather curious specimen of private interpretation of the Scripture.

“Abi Zacharias sent Karoon to the country of the Yeman, and surnamed him the Muhdi, (director,) and Karoon understood the secrets of the four books, viz., ‘the Psalms, the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Koran,’ and his faith was promulgated all over the earth.

“And his faith was in the place of one whole day of the three days mentioned in the Gospel on the preaching of Jesus, who said to the people, ‘*Destroy this temple, and I will raise it after three days.*’

“And it was meant by the three days that the faith of Jesus should last half a day, from twelve o'clock to the evening, and the faith of Soliman, the Persian, from the time of the appearing of the comforter, who is Mohamud, was to last one entire day; and the faith of Karoon also one entire day; and the faith of Kaem el Muntazar Hamsa ebn Ali, at the time of his manifestation, half a day, from morning to noon.

“In the preaching of the Lord, the Messiah, no manifestation takes place, for Jesus said unto the people, ‘My time is not con-

summated ; after me will appear a director, who is prevented from coming at this time.'

" And the Creator, [may he be praised !] manifested himself corporeally in the time of the fourth Heaven, in Abdalla ebn Hamed, under the name of Ali ; he is the exalted over all exalted, unto whom belongeth the right of command."—p. 411.

We should apologize for the length of these extracts, but it was difficult to attempt anything like a close abstract of doctrines, which have no system or coherence, and cannot be at all fairly judged but from the sample. The probability is, the mass of the Druses understand little or nothing of this secret learning, the knowledge of which is the chief title of the Akals to the veneration of the multitude ; and it is unquestionably a strange thing to find, living and vigorous, the identical heresies that beset the cradle of Christianity, that were refuted by apostle and evangelist, and have been long thought to be extinct. They do not, to be sure, put forward their ancient claim to be a part of Christianity, if not its essence ; but there they are, distinct and unmistakeable. It would not be easy to take up the broken links between the last of the Gnostics and the first of the Druses, and perhaps it might be matter for speculation whether any tradition of Gnosticism descended to the latter, or whether their profession, like the Gnostic heresies, was not the result of a renewed though isolated effort to connect the truths of revelation with philosophy and fable. It is, at all events, a curious phenomenon, and worth investigation by those whose leisure and course of reading would enable them to prosecute it with advantage ; and, taken in all its relations, the history of the Druses, their manners, customs, and religion, could not fail of being an instructive and engaging study. We thought it incumbent upon us in candour to notice what we considered imperfections and short-comings, in the execution of the task which, to judge from the title of his book, Mr. Chasseaud had imposed upon himself ; but taken simply as a contribution to our small stock of knowledge regarding a people so interesting and so little known, we have reason to feel indebted to him for the book upon our table. At the present moment, as he has remarked, everything connected with the East has an importance and interest which cannot always be counted

upon; but we do not see that in relation to the struggle going on there is any peculiar interest attaching to the Druses. They appear to be the special favourites of Mr. Chasseaud, to the exclusion of the other inhabitants of Lebanon. We have our own preferences, but have no right to quarrel with his, and if they make him a diligent and careful explorer, an accurate and faithful historian, so much the better for him and for the public. It is to be hoped our author has only taken the initiative in this matter, and that he will be followed by others, or take up the matter himself at a later period, bettered by experience and study.

Birth and residence in a country, though not to be overlooked in any one who undertakes to write its history, are not of that primary importance that the author would seem to imagine, and although they may secure faith for what he does write, they will neither make his manner of writing pass current, nor obtain indulgence for his omissions. There were a good many things entitled to commendation, as well as open to criticism, which we should gladly have noticed, but we are obliged to close for the present, too early, indeed, for the merit of the work, or the interest of the subject. We are willing to hope, however, that the labours of future investigators in the same field, which, in truth, is scarcely broken, may occasion a resumption of our own task, and we entertain no doubt that any work including a history of the conflict which began in 1841, between the Druses and Maronites, would of necessity record incidents as striking and dramatic, episodes as moving, achievements as daring, and horrors as atrocious, as any in the annals of mountain warfare.

ART. VI.—(1.) *The Chinese Empire*; forming a Sequel to the Work entitled, “*Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet.*” By M. HUC, formerly Missionary Apostolic in China. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Longmans, 1855.

(2.) *History of the Insurrection in China; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents.* By MM. CALLERY and IVAN. 8vo. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1853.

(3.) *Discoveries in Chinese; or the Symbolism of the Primitive Characters of the Chinese System of Writing.* By STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS. 8vo. New York: Norton, 1854.

THE historian of Lord Macartney's embassy to China confesses, that “they entered Peking like beggars, stayed in it like prisoners, and were driven out of it like thieves.” If the truth were fairly told, such has been the normal condition of modern travellers in China. Even the so-called “opening” of the Celestial Empire has afforded marvellously small opportunity for observation: and there needs but little scrutiny, if any, of the vapid and superficial narratives to which it has given occasion, in order to discover that if the writers tell but little, it is simply because they themselves have seen even less than what they relate.

As regards the open ports, it is true, the facilities of observation have been very materially enlarged since the termination of the war. But it would be a great fallacy to receive a description of the half-europeanized society of these mere depôts of commerce, as a complete, or generally faithful picture of the social condition of the three hundred and sixty millions which jostle each other throughout the countless cities, towns, villages, lakes, rivers, and canals of this overgrown and over-peopled empire. And, for the rest of China, the real facilities of travelling; the opportunities of seeing the country, of examining its institutions and becoming familiar with its usages; the means, in a word, of obtaining an exact idea of its social peculiarities, are not one jot greater than in the old days of absolute exclusion. “The situation of travellers in China,” says M. Abel Remusat, “is not usually an enviable one.

At their departure from Canton they are imprisoned in closed boats; they are guarded carefully from sight all along the great canal; they are what we may call put under arrest immediately on their arrival at Peking; and, after two or three official receptions and interrogatories, they are hastily sent back again. As they are not allowed the slightest communication with the outer world, they can really describe from their own knowledge nothing more than the hedge of soldiers by which they have been surrounded, the songs of the boatmen who have accompanied them, the formalities employed by the inspectors who have searched them, and the evolutions of the grantees who prostrated themselves with them before the Son of Heaven."

It may well be doubted, therefore, whether the recent contributions to our stock of information regarding China, are in reality such as materially to modify the ideas which have prevailed since the publication of the various memoirs of the early Jesuit missionaries. Their information was obtained in circumstances very different from those of the modern traveller. The favour which they enjoyed under the benevolent emperor, Khang-hi, opened for them an access, not only to all the historical records of the empire, to its public institutions, and to the detail of its laws, its constitution, its agriculture, and its commerce, but to all those social and religious peculiarities which, even still, constitute the great puzzle of private life in China. The familiarity, too, with the Chinese language and literature, which long residence and careful and judicious study imparted, gives an air of solidity and confidence to their statements, very different from the half wonder, half conjecture of their modern successors; and above all, the spirit of association in which they compiled their information, and the mutual light and assistance, which, as members of one great body, and fellow-labourers in one great and holy cause, they communicated to each other;—have made their narratives appear not the work of a single writer, or the result of the experience of a single observer, but the fruit of the joint observation and the united intelligence of the most eminent members of this memorable mission.

Such was the deliberate judgment of the greatest master of Chinese literature that the world has ever yet seen—M. Abel Remusat. The theoretical opinion which M.

Remusat drew from his profound and familiar book-knowledge, is fully confirmed by the practical judgment to which the writer of the admirable work now before us, has arrived after long years of travel and residence in the country, and manifold experience of life among the singular races of this vast empire, from the beggar to the mandarin, and in all its motley forms, from the palace to the mountain hamlet.

Our readers, we are assured, will need no introduction to Père Huc, the lively and brilliant author of "*The Chinese Empire*." When last we took leave of this pleasant writer, it was with the earnest hope that, as the concluding paragraphs of his "*Travels in Tartary and Tibet*" seemed to promise, we might "meet him again soon and often." Even then, however, we scarcely hoped for so important and valuable a contribution to our knowledge of China and its institutions, as that with which we are here presented, as the fruit of his interval of leisure. "*The Chinese Empire*" is not, like the author's earlier work, a mere traveller's tale of what he had heard and seen in his adventurous journey; it is a learned, laborious, and scholar-like description of all that is most notable, as well as most characteristic, in the entire condition of the country which was the scene of his travel. And it is no exaggeration to say, that the volumes now upon our table form a compendious, but most comprehensive, encyclopædia of the religion, the laws, the usages, and institutions of China.

In so far, however, as the work is a personal narrative, it may be regarded as a sequel to the "*Travels in Tartary and Tibet*." At the close of that interesting narrative, we left Père Huc, and his devoted companion and fellow-missionary, Père Gabet, upon the extreme western frontier of China; which they had reached on their return from Tibet, by order of Ki-chan, the Chinese resident at the Tibetan capital, Lha-Ssa. By command of this jealous and officious functionary, they were proceeding under escort to present themselves before the authorities of the empire, and to render an account of the objects and motives which had prompted their unwonted and almost unheard of undertaking. The purpose of the present work, therefore, is to complete the history of that most interesting expedition. It contains the record of their journey from Ta-tsien-lou, on the extreme western border of China, to Canton and

Macao—a journey which traversed nearly the entire eastern and western diameter of the Chinese territory.

But Père Huc's work is far more than a personal narrative. He has contrived to string together, in a most interesting sketch of which his own personal adventures supply the outline, the results of his observation, and the fruits of his study, not only during this eventful journey, (and another journey equally adventurous, extending along the north and south diameter,) but also during a residence of above ten years in different parts of the empire. In this regard, the work is far more elaborate than the *Travels in Tartary*; and in every respect it is more important for the purposes of the general scholar.

There is another difference between Père Huc's "China," and the "Tartary and Tibet" of the same author, which the reader will not observe without deep pain and regret—the absence from its title-page of the honoured name of Père Gabet, with which that of M. Huc was so long associated, both in the former work itself, and in their numerous and valuable contributions to the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith." The good and zealous father, for so many years the associate of his toils and the companion of his wanderings, has been taken from him by death since his last publication. After surviving all the perils of the mountain and the desert, and for years braving captivity and death, in the various forms in which, in later times, they have been always present to the missionary in this jealous empire, Père Gabet died upon the homeward passage to Europe; on which he had set out alone, in order to take measures for re-organizing a missionary expedition to the kingdom of Tibet, from which he had himself been so summarily ejected.

Père Huc appears, therefore, as the sole author of the "Chinese Empire."

The travellers had been conducted by the escort assigned to them at Lha-Ssa, as far as Ta-tsien-lou, a small town upon the frontier of China. From this point the duty of providing for their transit devolved upon the local Chinese authorities; and in the first place on the authorities of the province of Sse-tchouen, the first through which their homeward route lay. Their case, indeed, had been referred for adjudication to the governor of that province, the viceroy Pao-King, cousin and intimate friend of the

reigning emperor. The seat of his court was, of course, at Toug-tou-fou, the capital of the province.

Taught by their past experience of Chinese officials, the travellers resolved, in their dealings with the mandarins, to carry all with a high hand. It is a maxim of state policy in China, to be strong with the weak and weak with the strong, and Père Huc and his companion appear never to have lost sight of this all-important key to the character of those with whom they were thrown into contact. Their first step, before setting out, was to exchange their Tibetan travelling costume for one better suited to Chinese notions; and the principle by which their whole course of conduct was shaped, may be inferred from the fact, that, being in all else attired after the newest fashion, in (sky-blue silk robes, and black satin boots with white soles,) they assumed *the yellow cap and red sash*, which in China are the distinctive marks of the members of the imperial family! The mandarins remonstrated against the assumption, but in vain. The travellers persisted in maintaining, as French citizens, their right of exemption from the customs of the country; and they carried their point. By the same steady firmness, which at times ran into what, in the mildest phrase, must be called "modest assurance," they succeeded in almost every contest in which they engaged. Insisting firmly, when firmness appeared sufficient; swaggering at time when stronger measures were needed; expostulating; threatening; even bullying, when occasion arose;—our sturdy adventurers fought their way successfully from one extremity of the empire to the other, baffling the roguery of mandarins, defeating the malice of commissioners, trampling on the pride of prefects, and openly braving the undisguised hostility of judges and governors. By the terms of the original judgment of the Chinese president at Lha-Ssa, in virtue of which they had been sent back from Tibet, they were entitled to be regarded as state prisoners during their journey, and to be treated accordingly;—their escort, lodging, maintenance, and means of transport, being all provided at the public expense; and the viceroy of the province of Sse-tchouen issued still more express and minute instructions as to the treatment which they were to receive. According to the usage of China, all such charges are provided for by the local authorities of each district; on whom, therefore, devolves the duty of supplying the travel-

lers with suitable lodging and entertainment during their stay within their jurisdiction, together with means of proceeding to the next stage of their onward route. These officials, consequently, had an interest in keeping down as much as possible every item of these charges ; in inducing the travellers to be content with the meanest and most inexpensive accommodation ; and in getting rid of them with the least possible delay. Hence the entire journey was one series of petty intrigues, on the part of the local mandarins, for the purpose either of altogether evading their claims to entertainment, or of making some secret personal profit while they seemed to discharge them. At one time the mandarin would refuse to recognize them as state travellers ; at another he would try, by neglect and contemptuous indifference, to force them into betaking themselves to public inns, or houses of entertainment ; at another, the supply of provisions would be insufficient, and their quality bad. And above all, the great point which they sought to accomplish, was to prevent the travellers being lodged in the Communal Palace ; a building which is maintained in each principal town for the express purpose of lodging members of the imperial family, and all functionaries of state, during their official stay in the locality. The pretences by which this right of the missionaries was almost uniformly resisted, were most various, and often extremely amusing. But their firmness, cool perseverance, and exceeding tact and cleverness, almost invariably triumphed. When they failed of carrying the Communal Palace by storm, they took possession of the next best public accommodation which presented itself ; and few tourists in any country can boast of a greater variety of lodging than M. Huc and his companion ; who appear equally at home in a Communal Palace, an inn, a monastery, a college, a theatre, and even a court of justice !

Scarcely less amusing are the travellers' contests with the officers and members of the escorts assigned to them in the several provinces. There is more of real every-day Chinese life in some of these clever and dashing sketches, than could be gathered from whole pages of description and dissertation. Thus, for example, the " Military Mandarin," " Master Ting," the " Weeping Willow," and the servant Wei-chan, are sketches not unworthy of " Boz" himself.

The route prescribed for M. Huc and his fellow-prisoner lay through the provinces of Sse-tchouen, Hou-pe, and Kiang-si, to Kouang-tong, in which are situated the cities of Canton and Macao. First of all, however, they were subjected to examination and trial at Tching-tou-fou, the capital of Sse-tchouen, and the first city of note which they encountered after entering China Proper. They were first cited to appear before two criminal commissioners, or judges. It was vehemently insisted that they should present themselves for trial according to Chinese usage, in a kneeling posture. True to their old principles, however, they doggedly refused to comply; and, to the infinite humiliation of the officials, and the undisguised amazement of the by-standers, the contest terminated in their being allowed to remain standing during the interrogation.

“An immense crowd surrounded the tribunal; amongst this assemblage of the populace, eager to see the faces of the ‘devils of the Western Sea,’ were a few sympathetic-looking countenances, which seemed to say, ‘You are in a very unfortunate position, and we can do nothing for you.’ The dejection of these poor Christians pained us, and gladly would we have infused into their souls a little of the calmness and peace with which our own were filled. The way was cleared by soldiers armed with bamboos and rattans, the great doors were opened, and we entered. We were placed in a small waiting room, with the two amiable companions that had been assigned to us, and thence we could amuse ourselves by contemplating the movement and the sensation that reigned in the tribunal. The Mandarins who were to take part in the ceremonial arrived in succession, followed by suits of attendants, who had uncommonly the appearance of gangs of thieves. The satellites ran backwards and forwards, in their long red robes, and hideous peaked hats of black felt or iron wire, surmounted by long pheasant’s feathers. They were armed with long rusty swords, and carried chains, pincers, and various instruments of torture, of strong and terrible forms. The Mandarins were collected in groups, talking with one another, and interrupting themselves frequently by bursts of laughter; the subaltern officers, scribes, and executioners, went and came, as if to give themselves airs of importance; and every one seemed to anticipate a scene that would be curious and seasoned by unaccustomed emotions.

“All this agitation, and these interminable preparations, had in them something of extravagance and exaggeration; they were evidently intended to frighten us. At length every one had found his place, and the tumult was succeeded by a profound silence. A

moment afterwards a terrible cry, uttered by a great number of voices, was heard in the hall of audience ; it was repeated three times, and our companions told us that it was on the judges making their solemn entry and installing themselves in their seats. Two officers, decorated with the Crystal Ball, then appeared, and made us a sign to follow them. They came between us, our companions placed themselves behind, and the two accused persons walked thus to judgment.

“ A great door was then suddenly opened, and we beheld, at a glance, the numerous personages of this Chinese *performance*. Twelve stone steps led up to the vast inclosure where the judges were placed ; on each side of this staircase was a line of executioners in red dresses ; and when the accused passed tranquilly through their ranks, they all cried out with a loud voice, ‘ Tremble ! Tremble ! ’ and rattled their instruments of torture. We were stopped at about the middle of the hall, and then eight officers of the court proclaimed in a chanting voice the customary formula :— ‘ Accused ! on your knees ! on your knees ! ’ The accused remained silent and motionless. The summons was repeated, but there was still no alteration in their attitude. The two officers with the Crystal Ball, now thought themselves called on to come to our assistance, and pulled our arms to help us to kneel down. But a solemn look and some few emphatic words sufficed to make them let go their hold. They even judged it expedient to retire a little, and keep a respectful distance.

“ ‘ Every empire,’ said we, addressing our judges, ‘ has its own customs and manners. When we appeared before the ambassador Ki-Chan at Lha-ssa, we remained standing ; and Ki-Chan considered that in doing so we were only acting with reasonable conformity to the customs of our country.’

“ We waited for an answer from the president, but he remained dumb. The other judges contented themselves with looking at us, and communicating among themselves by grimaces. The tribunal had apparently been arranged and decorated expressly for the purpose of giving us a high idea of the majesty of the Empire. The walls were hung with red draperies, on which certain sentences were written in large black characters ; gigantic lanterns of the brightest colours were suspended from the ceiling ; and behind the seats of the judges were seen the insignia of their dignity, borne by officers in rich silk robes. The hall was surrounded by a great number of soldiers in uniform and under arms, and along the sides were seated a select number of spectators, who had probably obtained their places through favour and patronage.”—Pp. 48-50.

This interrogation turned entirely upon their object and motives in visiting Tibet. The papers which had been seized by Ki-chan, the Resident at Lha-ssa, were produced, and an attempt was made by the “ Inspector of

Crimes," (the Chinese attorney-general) to give a treasonable colouring to their mission. Père Huc, however, with that cool dexterity which is his great characteristic, contrived not only to decline answering the interrogatories of this functionary, but to enlist so effectually upon his side the vanity of the chief commissioner, that the trial terminated in the abandonment of all the charges against them.

Soon after the close of this trial, which had the effect of completely turning the tide of opinion in their favour, they had an audience of the viceroy, Pao-king. He received them with great kindness, dismissed the mandarin who had been their escort, and had treated them badly upon the journey; and condemned in the strongest terms the officiousness of Ki-chan (whom he testily denounced as a *to-che* "creator of embarrassments,") in interfering at all with their liberty of residence in Tibet. He refused, nevertheless, to permit their return to that kingdom; alleging, that, having once been dismissed, he had no choice but to send them forward to the representative of their own nation at Canton or Macao. This, however, he promised to do in a manner befitting their character, and not unworthy the dignity of the great sovereign whom he represented; and in order to secure a literal compliance with his instructions in this regard, and to guard against fraud or ill will on the part of the local authorities upon the route, he furnished themselves with a copy of these instructions, detailing minutely the sort of accommodation to which they should be held entitled. We should add, that Pao-King remonstrated against the *yellow cap and red girdle*; but, on their persisting in the fancy for this costume, he laughingly gave way to what he considered an amusing peculiarity of taste.

Père Huc describes, with much humour, the childish simplicity with which this good old man (the most amiable specimen of Chinese official life recorded in the work) scrutinized the features and general appearance of the strangers, and enquired after the recipe whereby they had contrived to preserve so well their good looks and fresh complexion. His enquiries, too, on the subject of religion interested them very much in his regard; and Père Huc, after his arrival at Macao, actually undertook a journey to Peking for the purpose of renewing his relations with him, but was deeply mortified to find that the old man had died only a fortnight before his arrival.

After remaining some time at Tching-tou-fou, in order to recruit from the fatigues of their journey, the missionaries prepared to resume their coastward journey. At their parting audience of the viceroy, he communicated to them a circumstance which goes to show that the notion which used to be entertained as to the astronomical skill of the Chinese, is far from well founded. Speaking of the calendar, he confessed that the government had begun to anticipate a serious embarrassment. The first European missionaries, he said, had corrected many errors in the ancient calendar of China, and had constructed a perpetual calendar for a certain period, which had served, ever since, as the basis of the actual arrangement of festivals for each year. *This period, however, he added, was now drawing to a close;* and he asked Père Huc whether, as the Office of Mathematics at Peking *had declared itself incapable of preparing a new one*, it might not be possible to induce the missionaries to repeat the good office performed long since by their predecessors.

We cannot help regarding this as a favourable opening; provided only there be, among the members actually engaged in the present work of the mission, individuals capable of commanding by their astronomical attainments, the same respect and authority which rewarded the services of Father Ricci and his accomplished companions. Père Huc took occasion from this demand, to call the viceroy's attention to the signal ingratitude towards the memory of those distinguished scholars, which had been manifested by the Imperial government at Peking, in seizing upon the very tombs in which their remains had been deposited, and suffering them to be rifled by the populace, and treated with every species of indignity. He adds that the intelligence appeared to shock and startle the viceroy exceedingly; and that he promised to write at once to Peking upon the subject, and at a later time to make it matter for personal investigation.

Beyond the petty annoyances to which we have already alluded, and the amusing contests with the cupidity or dishonesty of officials, in the regulation of their dietary or their travelling accommodation, the missionaries' journey was not marked by any serious personal adventure. But it introduced them into almost every variety of Chinese life. It is, perhaps, to be regretted, that in this work, as well as in the "Tibet," the author has omitted to assign the

dates of the several events which he records ; and indeed, that, so far from supplying a regular diary of his progress, he has even left the reader almost completely in the dark as regards the time of his setting out from 'Ta-tsien-lou, merely stating that he arrived at Canton in October, 1846. Most of the information, it is true, is of such a character as to be entirely independent of time ; but we cannot help feeling that it loses in interest and lifelike character by this oversight.

The journey was performed partly by palanquin, partly by water. Their voyage across the lake Pou-yang, in the province of Kiang-si, was made in one of the ordinary trading-junks, and was disagreeable beyond description ; these vessels being all infested by a most disgusting and annoying beetle, called by the Dutch, *kakkerlac*, which delights in gnawing the ears and toes of the sleeping traveller. The voyage, however, from Nan-tchang-fou, the capital of Kiang-si, appears to have made ample amends for the wretchedness of their earlier river expeditions. It was performed in a very handsome and commodious mandarin junk, amply provided with every necessary, and even luxury, which could be desired. The entire distance from this city to Canton (with the exception of a day's journey over the mountain Mei-ling) was travelled in this manner ; the voyage having commenced at Nan-tchang-fou, and terminated on the great river Kiang, on which Canton is built. The whole time occupied between their leaving Lha-Ssa and reaching Canton was six months.

As a sample of Père Huc's mode of dealing with ill-disposed officials, we transcribe the following curious adventure. During their stay in the unimportant town of Han-yang, where they were treated so badly, that, under a mixed impulse of hunger and indignation, they were imprudent enough, instead of insisting, as elsewhere, on redress, to purchase provisions from their own funds, an impression had been created that they were weak and easy-going souls, whom it would not be difficult to impose upon. This reputation preceded them to Outchang-fou, the chief town of the province of Hou-pe ; and they soon experienced its fruit in being condemned to take up their abode in a miserable room, where they ran considerable risk of being suffocated. For two days

they found it impossible to obtain redress. At last, however, they resolved to change their tone.

"After having put on our dress of ceremony, we sent for some palanquin bearers, and commanded them to conduct us to the Governor of the Province. They looked at us in a hesitating manner, but we paid them in advance, promising them at the same time something handsome on our return, and then they set off with enthusiasm.

"We crossed the square, where the venerable Perboyre had been strangled, and arrived at the tribunal where he had been so cruelly tortured, and where sentence of death had been pronounced against him.

"We alighted from our palanquins at the entrance of the palace, and so far our enterprise had not been very difficult. We crossed the threshold, determined to bear down all obstacles that should intervene to prevent our approach to the Governor. We had scarcely reached the middle of the courtyard before we were surrounded by a crowd of satellites and attendants, such as usually throng the avenues to the great tribunals, but their sinister hang-dog physiognomies, with which we had been long familiarised, did not alarm us much. We marched on boldly, affecting not to hear the thousand remarks that were made around us, on the subject of our yellow caps and red girdles.

"At the moment when we were about to cross a hall to enter a second court, we were accosted by a little Mandarin with a gilt ball, who seemed to be acting as a sort of usher to introduce guests. He appeared quite aghast at our abrupt entrance, and placing himself in our way, he asked three times running where we were going, extending at the same time his two arms in a horizontal position, as if to bar our passage.

" 'We are going to his Excellency the Governor,' we replied.

" 'His Excellency the Governor is not there. You can't see the Governor. Do the Rites permit people to push in in that way to the first magistrate of the province?' and as he spoke he stamped about and gesticulated, and with his arms extended followed every one of our movements, jumping alternately to the right and the left to prevent us from passing. We walked on, nevertheless, without saying a word, and thus forced our introducer to walk backwards. As we reached the end of the hall he turned suddenly, and threw himself upon the two leaves of the folding door, as if to shut them; but seizing him by the arm, we cried out in the most imperious tone we could muster, 'Woe to you if you do not leave that door open. If you stop us for a single moment, you are a lost man.'

"These words inspired a salutary fear; he opened the door again, and we entered the second court, leaving the little man gazing after us in open-mouthed astonishment.

"We reached the Governor's apartments without any new obstacle. In the ante-chamber were four superior Mandarins, who, when we entered, seemed to doubt whether we were not ghosts. They gazed at us and at one another without speaking a word, and as if consulting each other as to what was to be done in these unexpected circumstances. At length one of them ventured to ask who we were. 'We are Frenchmen,' we replied; 'we have been at Peking, thence from Peking to Lha-ssa, in Thibet; and we wish to speak with his Excellency the Governor.'

"'But is his Excellency the Governor informed of your arrival at Ou-tchang-fou? Has your visit been announced to him?'

"'A dispatch from the Emperor ought to have informed him of our coming to Hou-pé.' We remarked that the words 'dispatch from the Emperor' had an effect on the Mandarins. The speaker, after fixing upon us for a moment an inquisitive look, disappeared through a little door. We suspected that he had gone to the Governor to announce to him the curious discovery he had just made; and he was not long before he returned.

"'The Governor is absent,' said he, in a perfectly easy manner, just as if he had not been telling a lie; 'the Governor is absent. When he returns he will send for you, if he has any thing to say to you. Now go back to your lodgings.'

"'Who is it who desires us to go away? Who told you to say the Governor would send for us? Why do you seek to deceive us by pronouncing words contrary to the truth? The Governor is here; you have just spoken with him, and we will not go away till we have seen him.' As we said this, we quietly seated ourselves on a broad divan that occupied a great part of the room. The Mandarins astonished at our doings made their exit all together, and left us alone.

"At Han-yang, as we have said, we had betrayed much weakness, and it was now necessary to repair this fault, if we wished to reach Canton in safety, instead of perishing in misery on the road. The benevolence of the Viceroy of Sse-tchouen could not avail us farther than Ou-tchang-fou; the Governor of Hou-pé would now have the disposal of us as far as the capital of Kiang-si, and it was absolutely necessary that we should speak with him, in order not to be abandoned entirely to the voracity of the petty Mandarins. We were left alone for a long time, so that we had full leisure to arrange the plan we intended to follow.

"At length an aged attendant appeared, who after having in a manner *applied* his face to ours, in order to take a good observation of them, said in a tremulous voice, that 'His Excellency the Governor invited our illustrious persons to come to him.'—Vol. ii. p. 153-6.

The governor attempted at first to put on an air of authority; but the steady coolness of our missionaries speedily

subdued him. They did not hesitate to ascribe the treatment which they had met to hostility to themselves and their country. That very city had been the scene of the martyrdom of Father Perboyre, and twenty years before of that of Father Clet, a member of the same mission. When the governor offered an indignant disclaimer of any evil intentions to the travellers, they reminded him of these facts.

“ When the time came, we said to him, in a very low tone, but with a certain cold and concentrated energy, ‘ Your Excellency, we are not in the habit of pronouncing rude and injurious words ; it is not right to assume bad intentions in our brethren ; nevertheless, we are missionaries of the Lord of Heaven ; we are Frenchmen, and we cannot forget that this town is called Ou-tchang-fou.’ ”

“ ‘ What is the meaning of these words ? I do not comprehend them.’ ”

“ ‘ We cannot forget that one of our brothers, a missionary, a Frenchman, was strangled here at Ou-tchang-fou, twenty-three years ago ; and that another of our brothers, also a missionary and a Frenchman, was put to death here, not quite six years ago.’ ”

“ On hearing these words the Governor changed countenance, and it was evident he was greatly agitated.

“ ‘ This very day,’ we continued, ‘ in coming here, we crossed the square upon which our brothers were executed. Can it then be surprising if we feel some uneasiness, if we fear that some attempt may be made upon our lives, especially when we have been lodged almost in a sepulchre ?’ ”

“ ‘ I don’t know what you mean ; I know nothing about these affairs,’ replied the Governor, hastily ; ‘ at the periods of which you speak I was not in the province.’ ”

“ ‘ We are aware of that ; the Governor who was here six years ago, as soon as he had given the order to have the French missionary strangled, was degraded by the Emperor, and condemned to perpetual exile. It was evident to the whole Empire that Heaven had avenged the innocent blood. No one, however, need answer for more than his own actions. But whose fault is it that we are now being treated in the manner we have described ? We have studied the writings of the philosopher Meng-tse, and we have read in them this : ‘ Meng-tse one day asked the king of Leang whether he thought there was any difference between killing a man with a sword and killing him with illtreatment, and the king of Leang replied, I do not think there is any difference.’ ”

“ The Governor appeared very much astonished to hear us quote a passage from the classical books. He endeavoured to throw a little more gentleness into his physiognomy and manners, and he thought proper to reassure us concerning the fears we had expressed

for our personal safety. He said that the Mandarins had executed his orders badly, that he would have a severe inquiry into the matter, and that every body's sins should be punished, since he was determined to have respect paid to the will of the Emperor, whose heart was filled with quite paternal kindness for strangers, as we had ourselves experienced in the treatment we had received at Sse-tchouen, and all along the road. He added that we should be equally well treated at Hou-pé, that we must not believe those stories of two of our countrymen having been put to death in past times. Those were merely idle and false reports invented by low people, whose tongues were always active, and given to lying."—Vol. ii. pp. 159-161.

In other cases, on the contrary, they were overwhelmed with marks of honour and respect; as after leaving Tching-tou-fou:—

“During the first hour of our march, we noticed all along the road the hurry and activity that is always seen more or less in the neighbourhood of great towns, but more especially in China, where traffic keeps every one perpetually in motion. Horsemen, pedestrians, porters, thronged the road, and raised clouds of dust, that soon completely enveloped us and our palanquins, and threatened to suffocate us. By degrees, as we advanced, all these busy travellers had to slacken their pace, and get out of the way, and, in fact, to stop, in order to allow us to pass. The horsemen alighted, and those who wore large straw hats had to take them off. Those who did not hasten to show these marks of respect to the illustrious ‘Devils of the West,’ were graciously invited to do so, by a shower of thumps with the rattan, bestowed by way of reminder by two of our attendants, who acquitted themselves *con amore* of so pleasant a duty. When people spared them the trouble by being voluntarily mindful of ‘the rites,’ they walked off, looking rather sulky, and eyeing with a disappointed look their idle bamboos.”—Vol. i. pp. 164, 165.

Instead, however, of pursuing in detail the personal adventures of our missionaries, we prefer to lay before the reader a few specimens of the results of their general experience, of the manners, institutions, and social and religious condition of this extraordinary people, among whom they mingled so long, and with such unprecedented freedom and familiarity.

The habitual student of the “Annals of the Propagation of the Faith,” will remember with pleasure the numerous and interesting notices of Christianity in China, which appeared periodically in that Journal

from the pen of Père Huc and his companion. In the present work, as being intended mainly for general readers, M. Huc has advisedly refrained from entering into this subject in much detail. He states, however, in general, that the total number of Christians in the Chinese empire is about 800,000; variously distributed over the eighteen provinces, which are governed by vicars apostolic, assisted by missionaries, both from the secular clergy and from the Jesuit, Dominicans, Lazarist, and Franciscan orders. Each vicariate, besides a number of local schools for youth, possesses an ecclesiastical seminary for the training of native clergy; and associations have been formed in very many places for the care and Christian education of infants, abandoned (after the cruel usage of the country) by their parents;—an institution from which the best results are confidently anticipated.

The position of the Catholic missionaries in China, nevertheless, is a difficult and painful one. The nominal toleration which they are supposed to enjoy is in reality not only painfully restricted, but miserably precarious. It is true that by virtue of an edict obtained by the interposition of M. Lagrenée, the French commissioner, at the close of the war, Chinese Christians are no longer punishable, unless for some specific crime against the law. Nevertheless, besides the reports to the same effect, which he received from several priests and vicars apostolic, Père Huc found the Christians in almost every part of his travel, in the most abject fear, from the malevolence or corrupt practices of the higher officials and their minor functionaries. As far as the free ports are concerned liberty of worship is guaranteed, and the presence of the representatives of the European courts may be expected to secure its maintenance. But for the interior no such security exists. All attempts at preaching in the interior are rigidly repressed: the offending missionary is liable to be arrested, and transmitted to the nearest consul of his nation, to be dealt with according to his own code; and although the law provides that this transmission shall be conducted in an honourable manner, Père Huc mentions certain very recent cases in which a French Lazarist missionary, P. Carayon, was sent to Canton loaded with chains, in the company of malefactors, and treated with such severity that he died soon afterwards; an Italian missionary was literally starved to death; and a third,

M. Vacher, in 1851, was arrested in the province of Nun-Gan, thrown into prison, and in the end suffocated.

This intolerance, however, of which Christians are the victims, is by no means based upon religious principles. It is the pure result of that system of jealousy and exclusiveness which is the guiding spirit of all the legislation of China, and of the whole machinery of its administrative government. Christianity is an object of suspicion, not because it is a religious system, but because it is a foreign, and is believed to be an anti-Chinese, system. It is looked to with a vague and half acknowledged terror as the fine end of the European wedge; and, as such, all its advances are jealously watched. Far from its being an object of apprehension on religious grounds, it is, on the contrary, regarded with profound indifference, and its merits as such are freely and unreservedly admitted. The real enemy to the diffusion of Christianity in China is not intolerance, but indifference.

“It is this radical, profound indifference to all religion—an indifference that is scarcely conceivable by any who have not witnessed it—which is in our opinion the real, grand obstacle that has so long opposed the progress of Christianity in China. The Chinese is so completely absorbed in temporal interests, in the things that fall under his senses, that his whole life is only materialism put in action.

“Lucre is the sole object on which his eyes are constantly fixed. A burning thirst to realise some profit, great or small, absorbs all his faculties—the whole energy of his being. He never pursues any thing with ardour but riches and material enjoyments. God—the soul—a future life—he believes in none of them, or, rather, he never thinks about them at all. If he ever takes up a moral or religious book, it is only by way of amusement—to pass the time away. It is a less serious occupation than smoking a pipe, or drinking a cup of tea. If you speak to him of the foundations of faith, of the principles of Christianity, of the importance of salvation, the certainty of a life beyond the grave—all these truths, which so powerfully impress a mind susceptible of religious feeling, he listens to with pleasure, for it amuses him and piques his curiosity. He admits everything, approves of all you say, does not find the least difficulty, or make the smallest objection. In his opinion, all this is ‘true, fine, grand,’ and he puts himself into an oratorical attitude, and makes a beautiful speech against idolatry, and in favour of Christianity. He deplures the blindness of men, who attach themselves to the perishable goods of this world; perhaps he will even give utterance to some fine sentences on the happiness of

knowing the true God ; of serving him, and of meriting by this means the reward of eternal life. To listen to him, you would think him just ready to become a Christian, in fact, that he was such already ; yet he has not advanced a single step. It must not, however, be supposed that his speeches are wholly insincere ; he does really—after a fashion—believe what he says ; at all events, he has certainly no conviction to the contrary ; he merely never thinks of religion as a serious matter at all. He likes very well to talk about it ; but it is as of a thing not made for him—that he personally has nothing to do with it. The Chinese carry this indifference so far,—religious sensibility is so entirely withered or dead within them,—that they care not a straw whether a doctrine be true or false, good or bad. Religion is to them simply a fashion, which those may follow who have a taste for it.

“ In one of the principal towns of China, we were for some time in communication with a lettered Chinese, who appeared extremely well disposed to embrace Christianity. We had several conferences together, and we studied carefully the most important and difficult points of doctrine, and finally, by way of complement to our oral instruction, we read some of the best books. Our dear Catechumen admitted, without any exception, every thing we advanced ; the only difficulty was, he said, the learning by heart the prayers, that every good Christian ought to know, in order to say them morning and evening. As he seemed nevertheless to desire putting off to some indefinite period the moment in which he should declare himself a Christian, every time he came to see us we urged him to do so, and made the most earnest representation of the duty of following the truth, now that he knew where it lay. ‘ By and by,’ said he ; ‘ all in good time. One should never be precipitate.’ One day, however, he spoke out a little more. ‘ Come,’ said he, ‘ let us speak to-day only words conformable to reason. It is not good to be too enthusiastic. No doubt the Christian religion is beautiful and sublime ; its doctrine explains, with method and clearness, all that it is necessary for man to know. Whoever has any sense must see that, and will adopt it in his heart in all sincerity ; but, after all, one must not think too much of these things, and increase the cares of life. Now, just consider—we have a body ; how many cares it demands ! It must be clothed, fed, and sheltered from the injuries of the weather ; its infirmities are great, and its maladies numerous. It is agreed on all hands, that health is our most precious good. This body that we see, that we touch, must be taken care of every day, and every moment of the day. Now is not this enough, without troubling ourselves about a soul that we never do see ? The life of man is short and full of misery ; it is made up of a succession of important concerns, that follow one another without interruption. Our hearts and our minds are scarcely sufficient for the solitudes of the present life—is it wise then to torment one’s self about the future one ?’—Vol. i. p. 160—163.

Indeed, the indifference of this strange race extends to more than supernatural interests. There is much humour, and not without application to our own times and circumstances, in the following incident of Chinese travel.

“In ordinary times, and when they are not under the influence of any revolutionary movement, the Chinese are not at all inclined to meddle with affairs of government; they are a delightfully quiet people to deal with. In 1851, at the period of the death of the Emperor *Tao-kouang*, we were travelling on the road from Peking, and one day, when we had been taking tea at an inn in company with some Chinese citizens, we tried to get up a little political discussion. We spoke of the recent death of the Emperor, an important event which, of course, must have interested everybody. We expressed our anxiety on the subject of the succession to the Imperial throne, the heir to which was not yet publicly declared. ‘Who knows,’ said we, ‘which of the three sons of the Emperor will have been appointed to succeed him? If it should be the eldest, will he pursue the same system of government? If the younger, he is still very young; and it is said there are contrary influences, two opposing parties, at court—to which will he lean?’ We put forward, in short, all kinds of hypotheses, in order to stimulate these good citizens to make some observation. But they hardly listened to us. We came back again and again to the charge, in order to elicit some opinion or other, on questions that really appeared to us of great importance. But to all our piquant suggestions, they replied only by shaking their heads, puffing out whiffs of smoke, and taking great gulps of tea.

“This apathy was really beginning to provoke us, when one of these worthy Chinese, getting up from his seat, came and laid his two hands on our shoulders in a manner quite paternal, and said, smiling rather ironically,—

“‘Listen to me, my friend! Why should you trouble your heart and fatigue your head by all these vain surmises? The Mandarins have to attend to affairs of State; they are paid for it. Let them earn their money, then. But don’t let us torment ourselves about what does not concern us. We should be great fools to want to do political business for nothing.’

“‘That is very conformable to reason,’ cried the rest of the company; and thereupon they pointed out to us that our tea was getting cold and our pipes were out.’”—Vol. i. pp. 96, 97.

As regards the actual religion of the Chinese population, Père Huc’s account fully bears out this picture of their indifference to Christianity. There can hardly be said to be such a thing as a state religion in China; but all religions are tolerated unless those which are reputed

to be politically dangerous—the real ground, as we have seen, of the national antipathy to Christianity. There are three religions, however, which are recognized as equally good, and equally admissible to all the social and political advantages of citizenship: the *Jou Kiao*, or “Doctrine of the Lettered,” which is the religion of Confucius; the religion of the *Tao-Sse*, or “Doctors of Reason,” derived from the teaching of Lao-Tze, a philosopher contemporary with Confucius; and the religion of Fo, which is the Chinese transcript of Buddha, the imported Buddhism of ancient India. We can only refer to Père Huc’s own pages for a very brief but accurate and comprehensive account of all these religions. But, as illustrating the actual condition of religious feeling among the Chinese, we cannot pass over the following startling revelation.

“The three religions of which we have spoken in the preceding chapter, and which are personified by Confucius, Lao-tze, and Buddha, or Fo, still exist in China. After having struggled fiercely for ages, the one against the other, they are now united in universal indifferentism, and there reigns among them the most profound peace. This result must be principally attributed to the literary classes.

“The Doctors of Reason and the Buddhists had abandoned themselves to so many superstitions, that the disciples of Confucius had no great difficulty in turning them into ridicule. The pamphlets full of spirited satire which they have continually been firing off at the Bonzes and the Tao-sse have at length stifled in these people every religious sentiment, and the Emperors themselves have done their parts towards plunging the nation into the scepticism which is eating away its spiritual life, and effecting its dissolution with frightful rapidity. There is still extant a collection of sentences composed by the Emperor Khang-Hi for the instruction of his people; and Yoang-tching, who succeeded him on the Imperial throne, has made commentaries on his father’s sentences, which are intended to be read in public by the magistrates. One of the points on which the princely commentator particularly insists, is the propriety of cherishing an aversion to all false sects, that is to say, in fact, for all religions. He passes them in review, and condemns them all, without exception; but that of Buddhism, which is the most widely diffused in China, is especially the object of his reprobation. He speaks of the dogmas on which it rests with contempt; he turns its practices into derision.

“The Buddhists, like other followers of Indian sects, attach much importance to certain words or syllables, which they repeat continually, thinking to purify themselves from their sins, by the

mere articulation of these holy syllables, and to effect their salvation by this easy method. The Imperial commentator rallies them keenly upon this practice. 'Suppose,' he says, 'you had violated the laws in some way, and that you were taken into the hall of judgment to be punished; do you think if you were to go on bawling a thousand times over, 'Your Excellency! your Excellency!' the magistrate would be any more likely to spare you for that?' In other passages, this comparison tends to nothing less than the destruction of all idea of worship or homage rendered to the divinity. These sentences are real lessons in atheism, addressed by a sovereign to his subjects.

" 'If you do not burn any paper in honour of Fo, and if you do not deposit any offerings on his altar, he will be displeased, you think, and send his judgments on your head. What a miserable creature must your god Fo be then! Let us take the example of the magistrate of your district: should you never go to compliment him, and pay your court to him, if you are a honest people, attentive to your duty, he will not the less be well disposed towards you; but if you transgress the law, commit violence, and encroach on the rights of others, he will always be dissatisfied with you, though you should find a thousand ways of flattering him.' The Christian religion is, of course, not spared by the commentator of the Emperor Khang-hi, who was very favourably disposed towards the missionaries, but regarded them merely as artists and learned men, from whom he might obtain some advantage for the State, as the following passage from his successor, Yoang-tching, will tend to prove. 'The sect of the Lord of Heaven,' he says, 'a sect that is perpetually talking about heaven and earth, and beings without substance or shadow, this religion, also, is perverted and corrupt; but as the Europeans who teach it understand astronomy and mathematics, the Government has employed them to correct the calendar. It by no means meant, however, to imply that their religion was good, and you must not believe anything they tell you.'

"Such instruction as this, coming from so high a quarter, could not fail to bear fruit, and all belief in spiritual things and a future life has been accordingly extinguished.

"The religious sentiment has vanished from the national mind; the rival doctrines have lost all authority, and their partisans, grown sceptical and impious, have fallen into the abyss of indifferentism, in which they have given each other the kiss of peace. Religious discussions have entirely ceased, and the whole Chinese nation has proclaimed this famous formula, with which everybody is satisfied, *San-kiao-y-kiao*, that is, 'the three religions are but one.' Thus all the Chinese are at the same time partisans of Confucius, Lao-tze, and Buddha, or rather, they are nothing at all; they reject all faith, all dogma, to live merely by their more or less depraved and corrupted instincts."—Vol. ii. pp. 195—198.

“From all that we have said concerning the present condition of the various modes of worship recognised in China, and the position of their ministers, it is allowable to conclude that the Chinese are living absolutely without religion. There remain among them a few superstitious practices, to which they yield, rather from habit than conviction, and from which they are very easily detached. No account whatever is taken of religious belief by the legislature, and the magistrates only speak of it to turn it into ridicule. The idea of an atheistical government, and an atheistical law, which in France was so extolled in the Chamber of Deputies, has been actually realised in China, but it does not seem that the nation has greatly gained thereby in grandeur and prosperity.”—Vol. ii. pp. 210, 211.

~~Père~~ Huc's account of the monastic institute of China, and of the habits of life followed, both by the Bonzes and the Bonzesses, is very interesting, and contrasts curiously with his sketches of life among the Lamas in his travels in Tartary and Tibet. He has analyzed well, too, the strange mixture of scepticism and superstition by which the forms of all the old religions are maintained in China, although the soul of faith has long ceased to animate them. We shall transcribe a single anecdote as an example of the entire.

“During our residence at Ou-tchang-fou, in the establishment called *Si-men-yuen*, or Garden of the Western Gate, we happened to be witnesses of an occurrence which shows how possible it is to reconcile the most superstitious practices with the total absence of any religious conviction. We have said that this vast institution, where we were awaiting the day of our departure, had various tenants of different classes. Opposite to the apartment assigned to us, in a spacious court, there was another wing of the building, in a rather elegant style. This was occupied by a retired Mandarin, with a numerous family, who had held formerly a high office in the magistracy, and who had delayed for two years his return to his native province, in the hope that his influence with the first functionaries of the town might obtain for his eldest son a small Mandarinate. This aspirant had as yet only the grade of Bachelor, though he was married, and had three children. During these two years of expectation, the hopes of the old Mandarin had not been realised, but his son, instead of being promoted to a public office, had fallen ill of a malady that seemed likely to carry him to the tomb. At the time of our arrival we found the family plunged into great grief, for the state of the sick man was so alarming that they were already preparing to make him a coffin. The death of

this young man would, it was evident, be regarded by the whole family as a terrible event, for he was its hope and support.

“On the very first night that we passed in our new lodging, the Garden of the Western Gate resounded with cries and the letting off of fireworks, which were heard, sometimes on one side, sometimes on the other, but almost without interruption. The purpose of all this clamour was to save the dying man.

“The Chinese think, as we do, that death is the result of the definite separation of the soul from the body, but they also think that the degree of illness is in direct proportion to the number of attempts which the soul makes to escape, and when the sufferer experiences the terrible crises that endanger his life, it is a proof that the soul has been momentarily absent, that it keeps going away to a certain distance, but returns again. The distance being so small, it is still able to exercise considerable influence on the body, and keep it alive, although it suffers dreadfully from this transitory separation; if the dying person falls into the last agony, it is evident that the soul has gone with the firm resolution not to come back again. Nevertheless all hope is not yet lost, and there is a method of making it take up its abode again in the unfortunate body that is struggling with death. They try first the effect of persuasion, and endeavour by prayers and supplications to induce the soul to change its resolution. They run after it, they conjure it to come back, they describe in the most moving terms the lamentable state to which they will be reduced if this obstinate soul will not hear reason. They tell it that the happiness of the entire family depends upon it, they urge it, flatter it, overwhelm it with entreaties. ‘Come back, come back!’ they cry, ‘what have we done, what have we done to you? What motive can you have for going away? Come back we conjure you,’ and as no one knows very well which way the soul is gone, they run in all directions, and make a thousand evolutions in the hope of meeting it, and softening it by their prayers and tears.

“If these mild and insinuating methods do not succeed, if the soul remains deaf, and persists coolly in going its own way, they adopt another course, and try and frighten it. They utter loud cries, they let off fireworks suddenly in every direction in which they imagine it might be making off; they stretch out their arms to bar its passage, and push with their hands to force it to return home and re-enter the body. Amongst those who set out on the chase after a refractory soul, there are always some more skilful than others, who manage to get upon its track. Then they summon the others to help them, calling out, ‘Here it is! here it is!’ and immediately everybody runs that way. They then unite their forces, they concentrate their plan of operations, they weep, they groan, they lament, they let off squibs and crackers of all kinds, they make a frightful *charivari* round the poor soul, and hustle it

about in all sorts of ways, so that if it does not give it up at last, it must really be a most stubborn and ill-disposed spirit.

“ When they are setting out on this strange errand they never fail to take lanterns with them in order to light the soul on its way back, and take away any pretence it might make of not being able to find it. These ceremonies mostly take place during the night, because, say the Chinese, the soul is in the habit of taking advantage of the darkness to slip away.”—Vol. ii. pp. 211-214.

A still more ludicrously absurd superstition is observable in connection with the funeral ceremonial. The funeral array is not only attended by a crowd of professional weepers, and accompanied by gongs and other noisy instruments of music, but it is also signalized by the discharge of fire-arms, and various kinds of pyrotechnical explosions. The object of these strange devices is to frighten away the demons which are supposed to pursue, and endeavour to seize the soul of the defunct. But the strangest device of all consists in their strewing about the road in all directions sapecks and *fictitious bank notes*, in order that the devils (who are known to be very fond of money) may be tempted away in pursuit of the supposed bank notes, and that thus, while they are engaged in pursuing those deceitful appearances, the soul may be enabled to proceed quietly upon its way after the coffin which it follows to the last resting-place!

He explains in the same way that worship of ancestors, which formerly occasioned so many controversies between the Jesuit and Dominican missionaries, and which, though still scrupulously maintained, is yet regarded as a hollow and unmeaning ceremony. It is impossible, however, to doubt, that however intended, this ceremonial is in itself, and of its own nature, religious, and not purely civil in its character.

We would most gladly accompany Père Huc through the whole series of his sketches of men and things in China. There is not a topic of interest which he has overlooked—society, morals, politics, law, literature, science, art, costume, commerce, geography, agriculture, horticulture, pisciculture, even down to juggling and rope-dancing. But the information which he has compressed into these admirable sketches is so full and yet so comprehensive, as to preclude the possibility of further condensation. We must, therefore, be content with a few of these topics,

referring the reader, who may desire full information, to the pregnant pages of the work itself.

Père Huc's picture of Chinese morality is fearful in the extreme. Not to speak of the universal dishonesty, want of principle, and utter faithlessness of every class; of the absence of all the higher and more elevating natural affections; of the complete perversion of those domestic relations which are the natural safeguards of virtue; and of the thoroughly debasing and material tone which pervades every sphere of society;—omitting all these considerations, the condition of the people, as regards the external tests of morality, is deplorably low and degraded. Gaming and drunkenness, especially the intoxication of opium, prevail to an extent positively appalling. The grosser vices are equally universal. “Chinese society,” Père Huc writes, “has a certain tone of decency and reserve that may very well impose on those who look only at the surface, and judge merely by the momentary impression; but a very short residence among the Chinese is sufficient to show that their virtue is entirely external; their public morality is but a mask worn over the corruption of their manners. We will take care not to lift the unclean veil that hides the putrefaction of this ancient Chinese civilization; the leprosy of vice has spread so completely through this sceptical society, that the varnish of modesty with which it is covered is continually falling off and exposing the hideous wounds which are eating away the vitals of this unbelieving people. Their language is already revoltingly indecent, and the slang of the worst resorts of licentiousness threatens to become the ordinary language of conversation. There are some provinces in which the inns on the road have apartments entirely papered with representations of all kinds of shameless debauchery, and these abominable pictures are known among the Chinese by the pretty name of ‘flowers.’”

To the prevalence of infanticide, too, M. Huc bears testimony; although he is by no means so sweeping in his statements as some of the other writers on the subject. By some of the missionaries the practice is attributed to a superstition similar to that which is said to animate the Thugs of India. M. Huc ascribes it partly to the fearful pauperism, which may be said to be the normal condition of a large body of the population, partly to the universal

selfishness, and the absence of all the natural affections, that withering *αστοργη*, which now, as in the days of St. Paul, is the great characteristic of paganism, and which never fails to prove at once the accompaniment and the scourge of profligacy :

“ For ah, it hardens a’ within
And petrifies the feeling.”

“ As for ordinary infanticides—the suffocation and drowning of infants—they are innumerable, more common unquestionably than in any other place in the world, and their principal cause is pauperism. From the information we have collected in various provinces, it appears that persons in embarrassed circumstances kill their new-born female children in the most pitiless manner. The birth of a male child in a family is an honour and a blessing ; but the birth of a girl is regarded as a calamity, especially with necessitous parents. A boy is soon able to work and help his parents, who count upon his support for their old age ; the family is continued also by a boy, and a new link added to the genealogical chain. A girl, on the contrary, is a mere burden. According to Chinese manners, she must remain shut up till the period of her marriage, and she cannot exercise any kind of industry, by which she might make amends to her parents for the expenses she occasions. It is therefore the girls only that are murdered, as they are regarded as causes of indigence. In certain localities, where the culture of cotton, and the breeding of silk worms, furnish young girls with suitable occupations, they are allowed to live, and the parents are even unwilling to see them marry and enter another family. Interest is the supreme motive of the Chinese, even in cases where the heart alone ought to have influence.”—Vol. ii. p. 347-8.

It is a singular testimony, nevertheless, to the excellence of virtue and the superior merit of virginity, that, in the midst of this universal corruption, the natural instinct by which men are impelled to admire and honour chastity, even when they fail to imitate it, has made itself heard above all the stormy passions of this depraved people.

“ We noticed on our way, a great number of monuments of a kind peculiar to China, and which alone would suffice to distinguish this country from all others ; namely, triumphal arches erected to widowhood or virginity. When a girl will not marry, in order that she may better devote herself to the service of her parents, or if a widow refuses to enter the marriage state a second time, out of respect to the memory of her deceased husband, she is honoured

after death with especial pomp. Subscriptions are raised for the erection of a monument to her virtue, to which all the relations, and even sometimes the inhabitants of the village or district where the heroine has dwelt, contribute. These arches are of wood or stone, covered with sculptures, sometimes very well executed, of flowers, birds, and fabulous animals. Many of the ornaments and fanciful mouldings would do no discredit to the artists who decorated our finest cathedrals. On the front is usually an inscription in honour of virginity or widowhood, as the case may be ; and on the two sides are engraved in small letters the virtue of the heroine in question. These arches, which have a very fine effect, are frequent along the roads, and even in the towns. At Ning-Po, a celebrated seaport in the province of *Tche-Kiang*, there is a long street entirely composed of such monuments, all of stone and of a most rich and majestic architecture. The beauty of the sculptures has excited the admiration of all Europeans who have seen them ; in 1842, when the English took the town, there was some talk of their carrying off these triumphal arches, and making with them a complete Chinese street in London. Such an enterprise would have been worthy of British eccentricity, but whether from fear of irritating the people of Ning-Po, or from any other motive, the project was abandoned."—Vol. i. pp. 21, 22.

The reader may possibly remember a similar monument of the triumph of purity in the midst of corruption, in one of the institutions of Japan, alluded to in a former article.*

With our knowledge of the prevalence of the revolting practice of infanticide, we are the less prepared for the almost incredible statements as to the number of the population. It has been very variously estimated by different writers. Father Arniot, in 1743, sets it down so low as one hundred and fifty millions, while Lord Macartney, in 1794, made it no less than three hundred and thirty-three millions. Père Huc carries the estimate still higher, the last census, as he assures us, having amounted to the prodigious total of three hundred and sixty-one millions. This vast multitude is diffused very unequally over the empire, the total extent of which (1575 miles long, and 1800 broad,) he computes at 2,835,000 square miles, or above eight times the surface of France. In some districts the population is so thin that you might almost fancy yourself in the deserts of Tartary. In others, the mere habitations seem so completely to cover the very surface

* Vol. xxxiii. p. 286.

of the land, that the traveller is puzzled to conceive what portion is reserved for cultivation, or how the bare necessities of life can be raised on a soil every fragment of whose surface appears covered with the dwellings of its inhabitants. The results of this fearful over-crowding are painfully felt in the periodical visitations of famine with which China is scourged. Not a year passes in which multitudes do not perish in one part or another of the empire, and "the multitude of those who live merely from day to day is incalculable. Let a drought, an inundation, or any accident whatever, occur to injure the harvest in a single province, and two-thirds of the population are immediately reduced to a state of starvation. You see them then forming themselves into numerous bands—perfect armies of beggars—and proceeding together, men, women, and children, to seek in the towns and villages for some little nourishment wherewith to sustain, for a brief interval, their miserable existence. Many fall down fainting by the wayside, and die before they can reach the place where they had hoped to find help. You see their bodies lying in the fields, and at the road side, and you pass without taking much notice of them,—so familiar is the horrid spectacle."

The author's picture of Chinese morality will prepare the reader for the exceedingly depraved and licentious tone of the popular literature. The novels, plays, ballads, and general light literature, are, for the most part, disgustingly loose and indelicate. And although the literary profession is held in the lowest possible repute, and, indeed, may be said to be ignored as a profession altogether, the number of these light ephemeral publications is very considerable. By a sort of poetical retribution the Chinese authors have made the western kingdoms the abode of the fabulous monsters which they delight to depict, as the western nations have generally drawn upon the east for the same purpose; and M. Huc tells us of burlesque books of western travel, like those of Gulliver, in which the heroes are Dog-men, with ears trailing upon the ground; others which describe a whole nation consisting only of women; and others, again, in which we find men with holes right through their breast, who, when they wish to travel, have only to pass a stick through this hole, and get themselves carried across men's shoulders; insomuch that they may occasionally be met travelling in

this guise, two or three strung together upon the same pole !

Père Huc's observations on the Chinese language, and especially upon its written characters, are extremely solid and practical, and may be read with great interest, as the commentary of an experienced and practical scholar upon the ingenious essay of Mr. Andrews, the title of which is prefixed to this article. There is one observation of Père Huc which is quite decisive as to the *phonetic* value of the Chinese character. The missionaries have prepared little books for the use of their young converts, in which *the Latin responses* in the Mass, and other services of the Church, are actually printed in the Chinese character.

Corruption and sensuality are the besetting sins of the Chinese population ; nor are these national vices anywhere more fatally displayed than in the official service of the public, and especially in the administration of justice. It is a strange peculiarity of Chinese legislation that all laws, even where their object is purely civil, are in a greater or less degree penal. Hence the power over the person and liberty, and even in many cases over the life of the subject with which the magistrate is invested in China, makes his office a most formidable one in the eyes of the public, and, in the corrupt hands in which it is commonly placed, an inexhaustible instrument of rapine and extortion. It would be painful to go into the details of this corruption which Père Huc's volumes supply. A single scene will show the formidable character of the machinery which the system places in the judge's hands. It was witnessed by Père Huc and his companion on an occasion similar to those already referred to, in which, disregarding the remonstrances of the officials, they insisted on forcing their way into the presence of the chief magistrate of a town in which they had been refused the privileges to which their credentials entitled them. The magistrate was actually engaged in a trial at the moment of their entrance.

“ For ourselves, at the first glance we cast into the hall, we felt a cold perspiration come over us, and our limbs tottered under us ; we were ready to faint. The first object that presented itself on entering this Chinese judgment hall was the accused—the person on his trial.

“ He was suspended in the middle of the hall, like one of those lanterns, of whimsical form and colossal dimensions often seen in

the great pagodas. Ropes attached to a great beam in the roof held him tied by the wrists and feet, so as to throw the body into the form of a bow. Beneath him stood five or six executioners, armed with rattan rods and leather lashes, in ferocious attitudes, their clothes and faces spotted with blood—the blood of the unfortunate creature, who was uttering stifled groans, while his flesh was torn almost in tatters. The audience present at this frightful spectacle appeared quite at their ease, and our yellow caps excited much more emotion than the spectacle of torture. Many laughed, indeed, at the horror visible in our faces.

“The magistrate, to whom our coming had been hastily announced, rose from his seat as soon as he perceived us, and crossed the hall to meet us. As he passed near the executioners, he had to walk on the tips of his toes, and hold up his beautiful silk robes, that they might not be soiled by the pools of half-coagulated blood with which the floor was covered. He saluted us smilingly, and saying he would suspend the proceedings for a moment, conducted us to a small room situated behind the judge's seat. We sat down, or rather we fell, upon a divan, and were some moments before we could recover our composure.”—Vol. ii. pp. 245-246.

The same reckless cruelty is exhibited even before trial.

“One day, when we were passing along the road leading to Peking, we met a party of soldiers, with an officer at their head, escorting a number of carts, in which were literally piled up a crowd of Chinese, who were uttering horrible cries. As we stopped to allow these cart-loads of human beings to pass, we were seized with horror on perceiving that these unfortunate creatures were nailed by the hand to the planks of the cart. A satellite whom we interrogated, replied, with frightful coolness; ‘We’ve been routing out a nest of thieves in a neighbouring village. We got a good many of them, and as we hadn’t brought chains enough, we were obliged to contrive some way to prevent their escaping. So you see we nailed them by the hand.’

“‘But do not you think there may be some innocent among them?’

“‘Who can tell? They have not been tried yet. We are taking them to the tribunal, and bye-and-bye, if there are any innocent men among them, they will be separated from the thieves.’ The fellow seemed to think the thing quite a matter of course, and was even a little proud of the contrivance.

“Perhaps, what was most hideous of all in this dreadful spectacle, was the mocking hilarity of the soldiers, who were pointing out to one another with an air of amusement the contortions and grimaces of the miserable creatures in their agony of pain. If a people can exhibit such barbarity as this in quiet and peaceable

times, it may be imagined of what excesses they are capable under the excitement of revolution and civil war. In the provinces now in insurrection horrible abominations must be passing."—Vol. ii. pp. 269, 270.

There is one popular notion in reference to China, which Père Huc's work will go far to modify—the belief which prevails as to its social and political immobility. He shows by a comparison of Chinese history with that of other nations, and especially of France, that the revolutions which that empire has undergone far exceed in number and rapidity those of any corresponding period in the history of other countries. Between the fifth century and the seventeenth—a period of twelve hundred years—he enumerates no less than fifteen revolutions—not mere insurrections, the result of local or individual disaffection,—but complete and total changes of dynasty, accompanied by bloody and protracted wars, and generally ending in the utter extermination of one or other of the contending families. The most singular fact illustrative of this statement which he brings forward, is an episode of Chinese history in the eleventh century, in which an experiment precisely similar to the abortive *Ateliers Nationaux* organized in France, during the ephemeral popularity of Louis Blanc, in 1848, was actually carried into effect by a Chinese Louis Blanc, named Wang-nghan-che, and which, after convulsing the whole empire, and leading to the most fearful social results, terminated in a complete failure, and in the ruin and disgrace of its projector.

It would hardly be fair to close these interesting and highly instructive volumes, without giving the reader an opportunity of enjoying the author's narrative in its lighter and more entertaining views. We cannot afford space, however, for more than one or two extracts.

Having indulged ourselves somewhat at the expense of the natives of the Celestial Empire, it is but justice to let it be understood what are their notions regarding ourselves.

"The Chinese of the interior whom business takes to Canton or Macao, always go the first thing to look at the Europeans on the promenade. It is one of the most amusing of sights for them. They squat in rows along the sides of the quays, smoking their pipes and fanning themselves, contemplating the while with a satirical and contemptuous eye the English and Americans who

promenade up and down from one end to the other, keeping time with admirable precision. Europeans who go to China are apt to consider the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire very odd and supremely ridiculous, and the provincial Chinese at Canton and Macao pay back this sentiment with interest. It is very amusing to hear their sarcastic remarks on the appearance of the devils of the west, their utter astonishment at sight of their tight-fitting garments, their wonderful trousers, and prodigious round hats, like chimney pots,—the shirt-collars adapted to cut off the ears, and making a frame around such grotesque faces, with long noses and blue eyes, no beard or moustache, but a handful of curly hair on each cheek. The shape of the dress-coat puzzles them above everything. They try in vain to account for it, calling it a half-garment, because it is impossible to make it meet over the breast, and because there is nothing in front to correspond with the tails behind. They admire the judgment and exquisite taste of putting buttons as big as sapecks behind the back where they never have anything to button. How much handsomer they think themselves with their narrow, oblique, black eyes, high cheek bones, and little round noses, their shaven crowns and magnificent pigtails hanging almost to their heels. Add to all these natural graces a conical hat, covered with red fringe, an ample tunic with large sleeves, and black satin boots, with a white sole of immense thickness, and it must be evident to all that a European cannot compare in appearance with a Chinese.”—Vol. ii. pp. 102, 103.

Every one has read of the singular device of Floating Islands, to which the necessities of an over-crowded population have driven this ingenious and industrious race. Our travellers encountered a number of these curious structures in the course of their navigation of the lake Ping-hou, in the province of Hou-pe.

“ We passed several floating islands, those curious productions of Chinese ingenuity, which no other people seem ever to have thought of. These floating islands are enormous rafts, generally constructed of bamboos, which resist the decomposing influence of the water for a long time. Upon the raft is laid a tolerably thick bed of vegetable soil ; and, thanks to the patient labours of a few families of aquatic agriculturists, the astonished traveller beholds a whole colony lying on the surface of the water,—pretty houses with their gardens, as well as fields and plantations of every sort. The inhabitants of these floating farms appear to enjoy peace and abundance. During the leisure time which is not occupied by the culture of their rice-fields they employ themselves in fishing, which is at the same time a pastime and a source of profit ; and often, after gathering a crop of grain from the surface of the lake, they

cast their nets and bring up a harvest of fish from its depths ; for these waters teem with creatures fit for the use of man. Many birds, particularly swallows and pigeons, build their nests in these floating isles, and enliven the peaceful and poetic solitude.

“Towards the middle of the lake we encountered one of these islands on its way to take up a fresh position. It moved very slowly, though there was a good deal of wind, and large sails were attached to the houses as well as to each corner of the island : the inhabitants, men, women, and children, lent their strength to aid its progress, by working at large oars ; but their efforts did not seem materially to increase the speed at which they moved. However, these peculiar mariners do not probably trouble themselves much about delay, as they are sure of sleeping on land, at whatever pace they may go. Their migrations are often without any apparent motive. Like the Mongols in their vast prairies, they wander at will ; but, more fortunate than these latter, they have constructed for themselves a little solitude in the midst of civilisation, and unite the charms of a nomadic life to the advantages of a sedentary abode.

“These floating islands are to be found on all the great lakes of China, and at first sight present an enchanting picture of happiness and plenty, whilst it is impossible not to admire the ingenious industry of these Chinese, so singular in all their proceedings. But when you consider the cause of their construction, the labour and patience necessary for their creation, by people unable to find a corner of the solid earth on which to establish themselves, the smiling picture assumes a darker tint, and the mind endeavours vainly to penetrate the future of a race so numerous that the land will no longer hold it, and which has sought a resting-place on the surface of the waters.”—Vol. ii. pp. 96, 97.

Upon the same lake, too, they had an opportunity of witnessing the performance of the celebrated Fishing Cormorants of China.

“It is a curious spectacle to see these creatures engaged in fishing, diving into the water, and always coming up with a fish in their beak. As the Chinese fear the vigorous appetites of their feathered associates, they fasten round their necks an iron ring, large enough to allow of their breathing, but too small to admit the passage of the fish they seize : to prevent their straying about in the water and wasting the time destined for work, a cord is attached to the ring and to one claw of the cormorant, by which he is pulled up when inclined to stay too long under water. When tired, he is permitted to rest for a few minutes, but if he abuses this indulgence and forgets his business, a few strokes of a bamboo recal him to duty, and the poor diver patiently resumes his laborious occupation. In passing from one fishing ground to another, the cormorants perch

side by side on the edge of the boat, and their instinct teaches them to range themselves of their own accord in nearly equal numbers on each side, so as not to disturb the equilibrium of the frail vessel; we saw them thus ranged throughout the little fleet of fishing smacks on Lake Pinghou."—Vol. ii. pp. 100, 101.

We shall add one more fragment which, in addition to its own interest, has a fresh value for us in the present exhausted state of our fisheries, to the restoration of which it has begun to be applied with every prospect of success. It is curious to find that what among us is regarded as one of the newest triumphs of natural science, should have been in familiar use for centuries among this singular people.

"In spring a number of men go round the provinces selling spawn. Their establishment consists of a wheelbarrow loaded with barrels containing a thick liquid more like mud than anything else. It is impossible to distinguish the smallest animalcule in it with the naked eye. For a few sapecks you may buy a bowlful of this mud, enough to sow a large pond; it is merely thrown into the water, and in a few days the young come forth. When they have attained some size they are fed with tender vegetables chopped up and thrown into the water, the quantity being augmented as they increase in size. The growth of these fish is incredibly rapid. In a month at most they are strong and active, and require abundant nourishment. Morning and evening the proprietors of fish-ponds ransack the fields for suitable plants, which they carry home in enormous quantities. The fish rise to the surface, and throw themselves eagerly on their food, which they devour speedily, keeping up all the time a kind of murmuring noise, like a number of rabbits. Their voracity can only be compared to that of silk-worms just before spinning their cocoon. After being fed thus for about a fortnight they generally attain a weight of two or three pounds, after which they grow no more. They are then taken out and sold alive in the towns."—Vol. ii. pp. 382, 383.

On the all-absorbing topic of the present insurrection in China, which forms the subject of the interesting Essay of MM. Ivan and Callery, named at the head of our article, Père Huc's work contains no detailed information. From personal knowledge he was unable to speak, not having been present in the actual scene of the war; and he abstains from publishing the hearsay information which alone lay at his disposal. Nevertheless he enters, in his preface, at some length and with the same sagacity which distinguishes all his strictures upon Chinese affairs, into the

origin and prospects of the movement, and especially into its probable effects upon the religious and social destinies of the Empire. He makes it plain by a few sensible observations, that the silly anticipations in which certain Protestant journals had begun to triumph, anticipations of the christianizing or rather protestantizing tendencies of the insurgents and their leader, the adventurer, Tien-te, are utterly without foundation. He shows that, although in the proclamations they have paraded as a watchword the unity of God, and the abominations of idolatry, and have partially dressed up their fanatical manifestos in the phraseology of a sort of bastard biblicism, yet there is not a shred of Christian faith in their entire system of politico-religious belief. The semi-Christian notions which it embodies (but which are overlaid with the grossest superstition and blasphemy), Père Huc, with great appearance of probability, attributes, not to the diffusion of the Bible in later years by the agents of Protestantism, but partly to the Mussulman element which has been largely discernible in the movement, partly to the Christian books which have been compiled by the Catholic missionaries, and have been for centuries in circulation among the Chinese population, and of the general familiarity of the Chinese with which his own narrative supplies frequent and most convincing evidence.

As to the probable results of the insurrection he does not venture upon a decided prediction. But he is far from sanguine of any notable direct and immediate benefit to Christianity. On the contrary, he is rather disposed to look gloomily upon the future peace of the Church in China, no matter what may be the issue of the present contest. The Christians, he shrewdly observes, who have not taken any side in this contest, can hardly hope for favour with either of the parties in the event of its proving the victor. From the insurgents they have already experienced the most cruel persecution; probably enough stimulated by resentment at their holding back from the struggle, notwithstanding the appeal to their religious sympathies (evidently intended as such), contained in the first proclamations of the insurgent chief. With the present government, on the contrary, already sufficiently jealous, this very appeal of the insurgents will be an occasion of further jealousy and hostility against the Christians; nor is it by any means unlikely that their first success against

the rebels, may, especially in the remoter provinces, be inaugurated in the blood of the unhappy and defenceless Christians of the interior.

Nevertheless, even in the terrible contingency which he is thus forced to contemplate, as the result of the success of either of the two contending parties, Père Huc is not without his consolation. The great obstacle to the progress of Christianity in his opinion is the withering spirit of scepticism, indifference, and materialism with which the whole mind of China is infected. Hardly any possible new political combination can arise from which some improvement in this particular upon the existing stagnation of all religious feeling, and all ennobling or elevating sentiment, may not be anticipated. And it is through this intellectual inclination, and this alone, that he looks to the first great advance of Christian principles in China.

ART. VII.—*Descartes on Method.* Edinburgh: Sutherland and Knox; London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1852.

THIS is an ably-executed translation of Descartes' Discourse on Method. It affords us an opportunity of offering some remarks on a subject which has recently excited a good deal of interest among students of philosophy, and which to Catholic philosophers, especially, must be of the last importance.

The independence and supremacy of individual reason in philosophical matters forms a leading, we may say, indeed, the fundamental tenet of Descartes' system. It cannot be doubted that his speculations tended more than those of any man who had preceded, or who has followed him to effect a divorce between theology and metaphysical science, and a complete exclusion of the authority of the Church from the domain of philosophy. For bringing about this separation, it has long been fashionable to extol Descartes, and, among the enemies of religion

particularly, this is represented as the grandest achievement of his genius, the triumph of his life. The soundness, however, of a theory which, even in philosophical matters, makes individual reason altogether independent and supreme—competent of itself to direct man in the most arduous pursuit of knowledge, and to preserve him from error amid speculations as practically important to him as they are sublime and abstruse in themselves, has often been questioned; and, in our own time especially, a general conviction seems to prevail that it is at least extremely dangerous to attempt a solution of those problems on which Descartes so loved to speculate, without keeping our eyes steadily fixed upon the light of revealed truth, and our ears open to the teaching of the Church. It is worth while to examine the grounds of this conviction, and see to what extent the danger apprehended actually exists.

Whatever may be our opinion as to the wisdom or folly evinced in what are called philosophical pursuits, it is certain that they will always continue to engage attention, and to exercise an influence upon religion and social life. According to the peculiar turn of our mind, we may feel disposed to laugh at such pursuits, or we may have a predilection for them. One man will hold that they have not been too magnificently extolled by Cicero or Seneca; another that they are not too keenly ridiculed in *Hudibras*. But, at all events, no matter what may be our estimate of them, they will still be carried on. They are as old as thought itself; through all recorded time they have occupied the greatest intellects in the most polished nations, and unto the end men will not cease to inquire concerning the nature and attributes of the Almighty,—concerning the nature and destiny of the soul,—concerning good and evil—what is right and what is wrong.

Can such inquiries be safely conducted so as not to result in error, if we altogether put aside revealed truth, never looking to it or appealing to it for suggestion or correction, or help of any kind? Is the natural light of reason alone sufficient to guide us in the solution of such momentous questions without being aided by a single ray from any higher or more resplendent source. It is alleged as the chief glory of Descartes to have proclaimed that it is sufficient, and that philosophy can and ought to be utterly independent of revelation. Hence, those who hate

the authority of the Church delight to talk of him as a great deliverer, who was the first to succeed in breaking the theological fetters which had so long hung upon the intellect, and in awakening reason to a consciousness of its inherent strength and dignity. His countryman Cousin has exhausted eulogy in magnifying him as the "father of modern philosophy," "the emancipator who established modern freedom of thought," the leader who guided Europe from out of the house of bondage, &c. Though the disregard for revealed truth and the authority of the Church, which is a characteristic of modern speculation, may be and undoubtedly is traceable to the writings of Descartes, it would be singularly unjust to suppose that Descartes himself was not always careful to consult the Church, and submit to her direction. In the first place, he was scrupulously cautious that no theory which he propounded as a philosopher, should prejudice his faith as a Catholic. No one could have more emphatically expressed his conviction that the dogmatic teaching of the Church should be received with simple, childlike, unquestioning deference. In controversies connected with revealed doctrine, he admitted that authority was, indeed, supreme; and that there was no appeal from its infallible decisions. In all questions of this kind, he acknowledged but one judge, one witness, one sovereign mistress, one sole arbiter and rule of truth, namely, the Catholic Church. But, again, even in reference to philosophical matters, the whole life of this illustrious man (whatever may be said of the tendency of his theories) was a noble touching example of the respect due to authority, and of the influence which it is entitled to exercise over the most transcendent intellect. One of the wonderful thinkers of our own day has condescended to pity Descartes for the marked inconsistency between his principles and practice in this respect. He accuses him of timidity, vacillation, an inglorious shrinking from consequences, and so on; because, forsooth, after having written the *Discourse on Method*, and the *Meditations*,—after having sounded the silver trumpet of revolt from authority, and proclaimed the all-sufficiency and independence of reason, he himself still continued to look up trustfully to the Church, as a child to its mother, again and again professing his readiness to submit all to her revision. "*Nihil affirmo, sed hæc omnia Ecclesiæ Catholicæ auctoritate submitto.*" Nor can it

be disputed, that in determining the relation between authority and reason in philosophical matters, the example of Descartes was entirely at variance with his principles. As far as he was personally concerned, he was prepared to yield in all things to the Church; his proudest aim was to make his own conclusions square with her doctrine, and to exhibit natural reason, like the sybil, as confirming and illustrating, in its way, some portions of revealed truth. But the tendency of his speculations was widely different. The most signal result of the system which bears his name, was to accomplish a divorce between philosophy and authority. If men now venture, in propounding theories concerning the nature of God, and the destiny of the human soul, to ignore revelation, they allege that it was Descartes who taught them. If they proudly boast that in the solution of such questions it would be weakness to look for any other guide than individual reason, they say that the boast has been warranted by his principles. It was he, they tell us, who, in modern times, severed the ancient alliance between the Church and the schools of philosophy. They had long been united, as by a union of parent and child. Reason seemed conscious of its own waywardness and infirmity, and, accordingly, it ever appealed to the Church for help in its difficulties, for counsel in its doubts. Under the shadow of her wings it took refuge, as if there alone it could be safe from the arrow that fleeth by day, and from the business walking in darkness. But Descartes, we hear, came and effected in philosophical matters a change analogous to that which Luther brought about in reference to revealed truth. One taught that every man may construct for himself a system of faith, independently of the living authority of the Church; the other, that a man may, at least, construct a system of philosophy concerning God, the soul, moral duty, independently of revelation. Before proceeding further, we have one or two words to say on the subject of this parallel (which is a rather favourite one) between the German heresiarch, and the French philosopher.

Whether in the discussion of philosophical questions, even of those which relate to the nature of God, and the force and character of moral obligations, reason does or does not stand in need of authority, is not a matter of faith. Nor could the solution of the question, one way or the other, materially influence the controversy that

used to be carried on between Catholics and Protestants on the subject of private judgment. The truth of Christ's words is not dependent upon the admission or rejection of any particular method or system of philosophy; and He has declared that in matters of faith the authority of the Church is the only guide, the only rule. No one, therefore, should from seeing Descartes compared with Luther, and represented as having accomplished a revolution similar to that from which the Lutheran heresy has sprung, be seduced into a belief that, in a religious point of view, there was any sympathy, or affinity, or shadow of likeness between the two men. Such a supposition would be grievously injurious to the memory of Descartes, who would have shrunk from the idea that a Christian could revolt from the authority of the Catholic Church.

Again, the whole history of Descartes' life renders it certain, beyond doubt, that he never *intended* that the promulgation of his method should be made the occasion of discarding authority, even in philosophical matters. His willingness to obey the Church, and submit all to her decision, was evidently sincere, simple, unhesitating. His reliance upon the strength and capabilities of human reason sometimes amounts to extravagance; but there is not a single trait of his character which can be alleged as having anything in common with the insubordination and fierce turbulence of Luther. In fact, so far are the views of both men from being coincident, or in any respect substantially like each other, that in determining the legitimate sphere of natural reason, and the extent of its power therein, they are almost mutually contradictory. It is notorious that Luther and the early reformers sought to depreciate the influence of reason in the most unjust and arbitrary manner. Except, as a rule of faith for each individual, they would scarce deign to acknowledge its existence; all philosophy and philosophers were the object of their especial abhorrence. A respect for reason employed in the investigation of mere natural truth, would have been incompatible with Luther's theory concerning the effects of original sin; he held that after the fall of our first parents man no longer remained free; that his will no longer retained the power of choosing between moral good and evil; that his liberty became extinct. Thus, he tells us that a Christian is literally as incapable of controlling or regulating his own actions as if instead of

being a Christian, he had been a block of wood, or a piece of rock, or a pillar of salt, or any other lifeless, irresponsible object. Now, in this alleged extinction of liberty were involved, according to Luther, two primary defects; the one being a certain perversity of the will which hurried it irresistibly to embrace evil; the other a corresponding darkness of the intellect, which left that faculty liable to be the constant victim of delusion and error. Hence, reason was utterly powerless, and never to be trusted except as a rule of faith. But, in matters of faith, it was to supersede all authority. How marked is the contrast between this and Descartes' estimate of the capabilities and proper sphere of reason. Instead of denouncing philosophy, he attached himself to it with a devotion almost inordinate; it alone engrossed his attention throughout his entire life. Who has not heard of his vigils and meditations, of that vigour and enthusiasm in the "search after truth," which no difficulties could abate? The speculative tendency of his mind so strongly developed in his maturer years, began to evince itself when he was a young school-boy, at the Jesuit Seminary of La Flèche; even there, he was persuaded that reason, far from being always the victim of delusion, is competent to solve the deepest questions of metaphysics; and he would not be satisfied until his own reason should have completely solved them. With this view, he had, before attaining to manhood, actually examined and compared all the systems of philosophy then known in Europe; thinking that he did not find in any of them that for which he sought so eagerly—thinking that reason was capable of something better than the best of them, he went on to consult and study men as well as books. It was, perhaps, the intensity of his ardour in carrying out the design formed at school that made him, at one period, despair for a moment of accomplishing it; for we are told that he, at a time, tried to forget all his speculation and perplexities in the active duties of military life. But in vain, in the camp as in solitude, amid armed men, or in the society of students, in the service of Holland and of Bavaria, as well as in the quiet halls of La Flèche, the old ambition still clung to him and mastered him. There is not, we venture to say, a single name in the history of philosophy more remarkable than that of Descartes for earnest devotion to the study of purely philosophical

subjects, nor one which has contributed more to create an exaggerated notion of what reason can do in investigating them. So that in his estimate of the proper sphere and capability of reason, no less than in his reverence for the authority of the Church, Descartes was the very opposite of Luther.

But though Descartes' readiness to accept the dogmatic teaching of the Church could not have been more prompt or sincere than it was—though as far as he was personally concerned, he was, even in philosophical matters, prepared to submit all to her authority—though he never intended or foresaw that the method promulgated by him would lead to a divorce between philosophy and revealed religion, though the separation of the two is not perhaps a strict logical consequence of his method, yet it cannot be denied that the practical effect was to make reason as supreme and independent in philosophical speculations as if revealed truth had never been communicated. So far, only, if upon so slight an analogy one chooses to found a comparison, can Descartes be compared with Luther,—and having thus dismissed the parallel which certain parties in the English Church are fond of drawing between the men, we proceed to inquire whether individual reason may be justly regarded as supreme, all sufficient, and entirely independent of authority in philosophical matters. We maintain that it is not; and that in the discussion of questions connected with the nature of God—with the human soul—with moral obligation—it cannot ignore revelation without incurring great risk of falling into error on those important subjects.

To obviate misconception, it may be useful to explain our meaning somewhat more fully.

1. We have no wish to depreciate Reason, much less to follow the example of those who describe it as of itself incapable of arriving at a knowledge of any truth whatever without the aid of authority. It is finite, no doubt, but we are not therefore to exaggerate its incompetence; it is fallible, but not therefore in all things subject to delusion. We do not agree with those who would depress it too much, any more than with those who would too presumptuously exalt it—with those who would strip man of his noblest prerogative, and reduce him to the level of the irrational creation, any more than with those who would set him above archangels and make his intellect divine.

Every man experiences the *incredibilem veri noscendi cupiditatem*, and consequently every man must possess faculties capable of attaining it. In affirming this we would, of course, be understood as altogether prescinding from the controversy regarding the absolute necessity of instruction, of intercourse and communion of one kind or other with intelligent beings, the necessity of some *institutio aliena*, as a preliminary to even the most partial development of the powers of the human mind. This question we leave untouched. We speak of the capabilities of individual reason as it is found in persons enjoying the ordinary privileges of existence, not as it is found in fabulous wild men of the woods, like Orson, or in those forlorn specimens of our race whose history has been alleged in support of a well-known theory on this subject by Gerdil and Bonald. It has been argued by these illustrious writers that without some external aid, culture—instruction—the faculties of the mind—should remain for ever dormant, just as the eye would remain for ever sightless without moisture and light, or as the earth would be for ever sterile without the vivifying heat of the sun. Dr. Whately has recently adopted the same argument to demonstrate the necessity of an original revelation made by God to man. The conclusion arrived at by him in common with the two eminent philosophers to whom we have alluded, would be of the highest importance in determining the relation in which reason stands to authority; but as it is a conclusion still debated, we will forego the support that otherwise we might obviously derive from it. Whatever, then, may be the true theory on this subject, whether reason requires for its development some external aid and culture, or whether it would of itself, apart from all instruction, all intelligent guidance and direction, proceed in due course to frame judgments and construct arguments as an insect shakes off its chrysalis, as instinct teaches a bird to fly and a “bee to build its cells,” we hold that whatever may be the orthodox solution of this question, individual reason is perfectly competent of itself, without any light from authority, to acquire a knowledge of an indefinite number of natural truths, and to distinguish them from falsehood with unerring accuracy.

Hence, though persuaded of the necessity of recognising the principle of authority in philosophical matters, we repudiate the theory which has given such a disastrous

celebrity to the name of l'Abbè Lamennais. Without taking the votes of mankind, and ascertaining what their verdict may be, every one's individual reason is quite sufficient to convince him of the truth or falsehood of numberless propositions. The contrary doctrine, notwithstanding the mass of ingenious sophisms by which the Abbé, throughout so many years of his life, tried to maintain it, is false and degrading, and involves consequences which soon earned for it the condemnation of the Church.

Hence, also, we entirely dissent from the early speculations of M. Bautain. For the genius and eloquence of that illustrious priest we have the most profound admiration; nor is this sentiment lessened by a consideration of the promptitude and docility with which, at the suggestion of the authorities in Rome, he has modified and emended the objectionable views first put forward by him. But these views did in truth approximate too closely to those of Lamennais, and were based upon an assumption that human reason, when abandoned to itself, becomes utterly helpless, an imbecile erring thing, always unworthy of confidence, or at best no more than the "power to *guess* at right and wrong, the twinkling lamp of life fooling the follower betwixt shade and shining."

2. In opposition to the celebrated theories of Lamennais and Bautain we have said that reason is exempt from the inherent deficiency and incompetence with which they would charge it, and that it is of itself, independently of an appeal to authority, (whether that authority be held, with Lamennais, to consist in the unanimous traditional belief of mankind, or, with Bautain, to reside in the more accessible tribunal of the Church,) perfectly capable of investigating and ascertaining truth. Without presuming to trace the exact sphere or define the limits of this capability, we hold, moreover, that among the truths which thus naturally come within the province of reason, and in the description of which authority would be irrelevant, are to be reckoned those which regard the existence of God and the evidences of Christianity. No metaphysical argument is required to prove this: *Invisibilia enim ipsius a creatura mundi per ea quæ facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur; ita ut inexcusabiles sint. (1)...Coeli enarrant gloriam Dei, et opera manuum ejus annuntiat firmamentum. (2)...Vani autem sunt omnes homines in quibus non subest scientia Dei, et de his quæ videntur*

bona non potuerint intelligere eum qui est, neque operibus attendentes, agnoverunt quis esset artifex. In fact, if authority cannot be dispensed with in settling the elementary questions of natural theology, if individual reason be pronounced disqualified to examine or appreciate the evidences of revealed religion, nay, if it be not able to guide itself in making out the Church, so as to distinguish her with unerring precision as the one city upon the mountain, it is not easy to establish either the title which authority has to dictate, or the correlative obligation to listen and obey.

3. If, then, we are anxious to see renewed the old relationship which once subsisted between the Church and philosophy, it is not because we would undervalue what has been justly styled "god-like reason." It is a truly noble and glorious faculty, the best gift which, in the natural order, the Creator has bestowed upon man. Neither do we intend to convey that students should beset the porticoes of the church for the purpose of hearing lectures there on philosophical subjects. The Church of Christ has no direct concern with the progress of worldly knowledge, with the truth or falsehood of doctrines not divine in themselves or connected with the objects of her divine mission. She has been established but to execute the commands of her Founder, and He has left no mandate, open or implied, obliging her to look after the interests of science. She goes her way, and science and literature may go theirs. She has to deal, to be sure, with man's faculties, with his understanding, with his imagination, with his heart and affections, but with all for a purely supernatural end, and only with a view to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. We are as far, then, from holding that the Church has a title to dictate on matters purely philosophical, to settle controversies between the Academy and the Porch, between this or that rival school, as that reason is altogether inadequate to the discovery or apprehension of truth. As long as philosophy abstains from the discussion of questions which have been decided by a supernatural revelation, the Church possesses no right to control it, check it, or call it to task. With regard to scientific inquiries as such, whether physical or psychological, she is simply indifferent; and whatever influence she may exercise over the prosecution of them is always accidental and indirect. But if philosophy chooses

to enter upon a sphere in which the Church is supreme, if it should choose to tread upon ground already preoccupied by her, if it should undertake to pronounce upon questions that have been already answered by a divine supernatural revelation, then we hold that it is a duty, as well as a right of the Church, to look after philosophy, and if she should find it opposing, or throwing doubt upon, or trying in any way to create antipathy or indifference to the revealed word of God, to rebuke philosophy, to denounce its inference, and discountenance the methods which it employs in establishing them. Hence the science, by whatever name we may call it, which professes to solve upon natural grounds, by arguments drawn from reason alone and independent of revelation, the great questions which relate to the Being and Attributes of God, to a future life, to human liberty and moral obligation, is one which, in as far at least as it deals with these subjects, the Church may and ought to take cognizance of. She can no more tolerate an error on these matters, because merely natural arguments are adduced to support it, than if its author put it forward as a revealed dogma. She cannot permit Condillac to teach fatalism, because he pretends to derive that doctrine from the principles of Locke, any more than she can permit Calvin to teach it on theological grounds. Whatever contradicts revealed truth the Church places her ban upon, whether reference is made to the Bible or merely to reason, in support of the contradiction. Hence every Catholic will admit that if false doctrines concerning God, or moral duty, be proposed for acceptance under the name of philosophy, the Church has a clear right to pronounce them false and to warn her children against them, while, on the part of her children thus warned, there exists a correlative obligation to renounce and avoid them. So far, then, the position in which metaphysical science stands towards the authority of the Church is indisputable, if it should promulgate a false theory on the momentous questions alluded to, it instantly becomes amenable to her tribunal.

No Catholic will deny that philosophy, or science, or metaphysics, or whatever name we may bestow upon it, is thus conditionally subject to the revision and controul of the Church. If it should lead to error concerning the nature of God, or the essential character of moral duty, the Church, as the depository and infallible interpreter of

revealed doctrine, is competent to condemn the error and define the opposite truth. It may be asked, however, whether, even admitting this hypothetical subordination of science to authority, we may not securely go on speculating upon the attributes of God, upon morals, upon a future life, as if the Church had never been established, nor a divine revelation given; whether individual reason is not capable itself, irrespective of all aid derived from revelation, of avoiding error on these matters; whether individual reason may not, therefore, undertake to study and discuss them as it enters upon the study of the elements of Geometry, where it is as certain of arriving at the right conclusion merely by its own strength, as if the same conclusion had been revealed in every chapter of the Bible. This we take to be the true issue raised by the promulgation of Descartes' method. Whatever may have been the intention of its author, it spread a new idea throughout Europe, that the authority of the Church is as irrelevant in speculations connected with the soul and its Creator, as in the investigation of the plainest properties of triangles. It did not place metaphysical science in direct antagonism to theology, but it divorced it from it, and proclaimed that it might be independent of it. In the mediæval times it had been understood that he who undertook to speculate upon the divine attributes, or to examine his own soul's nature and destiny, set out upon a journey on which he should be sure to meet many by-paths that natural curiosity would fain explore, many cross-roads with finger-posts that seem to point to opposite directions. Difficulties might arise to impede him, or allurements tempting him to stay. Where there were so many windings and branch-ways it was considered hard to direct one's steps aright. This traveller might, without perceiving the digression, strike in upon a path which, though pleasant and inviting at first, soon leads to a place where sudden darkness falls upon him, and he can see but a deep chasm yawning at his feet. Another is attracted by some fair vista, it may be a round-about, but he will go by that way; it abounds in flowers; there is bright sunshine, and sweet fragrance, and therefore he will proceed by it. In short, it had been apprehended in the old time that there were a thousand chances of the traveller's being led astray. It had been well known, and universally acknowledged, that the greatest men of the ancient world,

the demigods, had, age after age, attempted this same journey, and had, one and all, uniformly missed the way. If acuteness, sagacity, boundless knowledge, could have accomplished the thing, who could dare hope for more distinguished success than Aristotle; and for strength or expansiveness who would presume to place his own in comparison with that calm, lofty, massive intellect, which the ancients used to call 'divine?' And yet Plato and Aristotle, the renowned wise men of Greece, an innumerable host of others, whose names are heard in every part of the world, as convertible with all that is great and pre-eminent—in fact, the long list of the worthies and sages of antiquity, each of them in turn had tried this journey we talk of, and had diverged from the right path. The best of them never succeeded in getting securely to the end. There still stand the ruins of the Porch, there still are the withered groves of Academe, the monuments of their failure. The melancholy result of their labour was, professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and they changed the likeness of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things. Previously to the time of Descartes, Christians had been taught to read in the gross errors of these singularly-gifted deep-thinking pagan philosophers a significant lesson; they were told that natural reason, if abandoned to its own resources, could scarce be considered more penetrating, more profound, more reliable in their own days, than was the reasoning power of Aristotle or of Plato; they were constantly admonished of the dangers and difficulties which necessarily beset those who would ascertain by mere logical argument what precisely is the nature of God, and would penetrate the essence of Him who far excels all else; for if you look to greatness, He is grander—if you look to beauty, He is fairer—if to sweetness, He is sweeter—if to splendour, He is brighter—if to power, He is stronger—if to mercy, He is kinder. Accordingly they were directed to proceed in their speculations concerning the attributes of the Supreme Being with humility and caution, they were recommended to avail themselves of the assistance which God Himself had given them in a divine revelation on these very subjects, which science undertakes to deal with, and they were forewarned that error and impiety would be the consequence of disre-

garding it. Hence the mode of conducting philosophical studies was based upon a principle fundamentally different from that introduced by the method of Descartes. Revealed truth was formerly to the philosopher what the chart and the beacon-light are to those on sea; by it he always shaped his course, without it he would not commit himself to the treacherous waves; guided by it, whether his progress might be slow or rapid, he was sure to be safe, and where interests so important to a Christian were at stake he freely preferred safety to adventure. Now the practical result of Descartes' method, however foreign to the views of that illustrious man himself, was to sever this connection which had existed between philosophy and authority, ready to embark with confidence in any speculation upon the most sublime and awful subjects, just as it would set about solving a problem in algebra, prepared to encounter all the perils of the sea, trusting exclusively to itself, as if the chart of revealed truth had been never drawn, nor the beacon-light ever kindled.

We are persuaded that in the study of God, and of our own nature and destiny, individual reason is not thus independent of revelation, and that if the two be divorced, the divorce will inevitably terminate in hostility and collision. We do not care to call in the aid of any *à priori* psychological argument to establish this position, we will allow it to rest mainly upon the history of opinion since the time that Descartes' method was first promulgated. Let us learn from that what have been the doctrines concerning God, the soul, moral duty, most popular among those who disregarded the authority of the Church, and who professed to trace their conclusions to Cartesian principles. The character of these doctrines, and of the metaphysical principles from which they are deduced, will be quite sufficient to enable us to judge whether reason is in reality possessed of the marvellous powers which men attribute to it, and whether it can, on these subjects, afford to overlook revelation. We are thus to examine the question proposed merely from a single point of view, and even our survey of the history of speculation since Descartes' time must itself be extremely rapid. To deal adequately with a subject like the present, much more to exhaust it, would require not only ampler space than the limits of a periodical can afford to it, but also more leisure and learning than we can devote to its discussion. As

the controversy, however, regarding the relation in which authority and reason stand towards each other in philosophical matters, is in this country a novel one, and as there may be found some well-meaning inveterate Cartesians who will sharply dispute the position which we have advanced, we think it right to forewarn them that they must not estimate the real strength of that position by the restricted means which a writer in a review is obliged to employ in its defence. It is a just observation, however common-place, that by which preachers, whether from modesty, or with deference to a worn-out rhetorical artifice, sometimes preface their discourses, and entreat their hearers not to judge of the cause they advocate by the arguments actually brought to bear in sustaining it. In a single paper no man could deal with a subject such as the present otherwise than in a circumscribed, meagre, and, if you wish, superficial way. We have, therefore, deemed it expedient not to let an issue so important go before our Catholic readers, without enabling them to see that the view which we have been putting forward, however inadequate our vindication of it may turn out to be, so far from being novel or singular, has always been recommended by the Church, and insisted upon by some of the most learned of the fathers. Accordingly we submit the few extracts following, not so much as a logical proof to confirm or establish our opinion concerning the insufficiency of reason, *per se*, in certain philosophical matters, as in the hope of removing from the minds of some of our Catholic readers all misapprehension and misgiving with regard to its correctness.

Tertullian pointedly says, that those who teach philosophy, trusting to reason alone, are the *patriarchs* of heresy. St. Hilary's testimony on the present subject is unequivocal and decisive. "Non est de Deo humanis judiciis sentiendum; a Deo *discendum* est quod de Deo intelligendum sit, quia non nisi autore cognoscitur." Origen writes thus:—"Quomodo Deo credere non sit rationi consentaneum majis, cum in fide *omnia humana* pendeant?" St. Justin reviews the systems of philosophy which had been prevalent in his own time—he points out their cardinal defects—he dwells upon the perpetual dissensions and shallow wrangling of the Sophoi—he ridicules the pretentious folly of those who overlook the authority of the Church, and trust to the all-sufficiency of

human reason, and accounts in this way for the absurd notions entertained by the wisest of the ancients, when they undertook to speculate upon the attributes of God, and on the nature of moral obligation: “*Quod in peritis discere noluerint, sed sese existimaverint mentis humanæ solertia claram celestium rerum cognitionem assequi posse, cum ne terrestrium quidem potuerint.*” And he concludes by contrasting the corrupt rival theories propounded by the wise men of Greece, who had entirely overlooked revelation, and trusted only to the dictates of natural reason, with the purity of doctrine transmitted by those who had not refused to be guided by the light of revealed truth. “*Quocirca cum veri nihil de religione a doctoribus vestris (the Greek philosophers) præcipi posse constet, et idoneum satis documentum nobis ignorationis ipsi suæ per dissidentes inter se factiones exhibuerint, reliquum esse opinor, ut ad majores nostros revertamur, qui et magistros vestros longe tempore anteverterunt, et nihil de suis ipsorum cogitationibus et placitis docuerunt; minime ipsi mutuis dissensionibus invicem conflectentes, aut alii aliorum dicta evertere in animum inducentes; quippe qui omni contentionis studio et factionum dissidio liberi, sicuti a Deo acceperunt, ita nobis doctrinam tradiderunt.*” Clement of Alexandria tells us emphatically that we cannot avoid error if we dispense with authority in the solution of philosophical questions, “*Quia ostensum est principii universorum esse eam quæ fide habetur scientiam.*” If, Theophilus of Antioch proclaims, in every department of life we are compelled, as by a necessity of our nature, to take many things on trust, how then, he asks, can we refuse to form our judgment on those sublime and abstruse matters which regard the nature of God, in accordance with the revelation which God Himself has been pleased to give us? “*Non animadvertis actiones omnes antecedere fidem, Quis, cedo, agricola metere potest nisi prius semen credit sulcis? Quis mare poterit trajicere nisi prius semetipsum credat navi et gubernatori? Quis morbis implicitus, sanitatem recuperare poterit, nisi semetipsum prius credat medico. Quam artem, quam scientiam quis discere poterit nisi prius semetipsum tradiderit et crediderit præceptoris. Si igitur agricola credit telluri, navigaturus navi, infirmus medico, tunc refugis teipsum credere Deo.*” St. Augustine’s book, “*De Utilitate Credendi,*” was written mainly with the design of establishing the principle

of dogmatic authority in matters of faith, but everywhere throughout the work he lays down clearly enough that in philosophical discussions also, which regard the nature of God, it would be extremely perilous to make reason independent of revealed truth.

We have now cited an amount of testimony sufficient to indicate the view entertained by the Fathers on the subject we are examining; they certainly did not make the same lofty claims for individual reason, which in our time have been so vehemently urged in its favour. They would, if the occasion had demanded it, have each and all discountenanced and reprobated the arrogant folly of those who would have us imagine that reason becomes degraded when it seeks counsel from the Church. They would each and all have declared that reason cannot be proclaimed independent of the Church, unless we are prepared to see independence eventually growing into opposition and defiance. And who has failed to remark the extent to which this proud spirit of defiance manifests itself at the present moment? In the allocution of our Most Holy Father, Pius IX., pronounced in secret consistory so lately as the 9th Dec., 1854, he describes the prevailing tendency to exaggerate the capabilities of human reason, and place it on a level with religion, as one of the most fatal errors of our time, and as entailing some of the heaviest evils which the Church has recently had to deplore. “*Sunt præterea, venerabiles Fratres, viri quidam eruditione præstantes qui religionem munus esse fatentur longe præstantissimum à Deo hominibus datum, humanam nihilominus rationem tanto habent pretio, tantopere extollunt ut vel ipsi religioni æquiparandam stultissimè patent.....Ita quidem rejecta Ecclesiæ auctoritate, difficilimis, quibusque, reconditesque quæstionibus latissimus patent campus, ratioque humana infirmis suis confisa viribus licentius excurrans turpissimos in errores lapsa est.....qui in religionis et civilis rei detrimentum, illudque maximum redundarunt.....Atque hujusmodi humanæ rationis sectatores, seu cultores potius, qui eam sibi certam veluti magistrum proponunt, ejusque ductu fausta sibi omnia pollicentur, obliti certe sunt quam grave et acerbum ex culpa primi parentis inflictum sit vulnus humanæ naturæ quippe quo et obfusæ tenebræ menti, et prona effecta ad malum voluntas. Hinc celeberrimi ex antiquissima ætate philosophi quamvis multa præclare scripse-*

rint, doctrinas tamen suas gravissimis erroribus contaminant.” Some of the worshippers of human reason will of course characterize this declaration as the latest attempt made by Rome to fetter the intellect, and abolish freedom of thought. They will talk of the folly of endeavouring in this enlightened century to set up a reign of despotic authority on the one side, and of blind uninquiring submission on the other. But surely a Catholic will not be moved by all their lofty speeches and vehement outcries. Athalia may rush into the temple, and at sight of the lawful king she may rend her garments and cry treason, but the people of God will not be influenced in their choice by any display of dramatic rage; they will take such phrases as enslaving the mind for what they are worth, and though they should be assailed by a thousand cries of treason they will acknowledge the King’s Son, and they will place the crown upon him, and the testimony, and give him the law to hold in his hand. They will never consent to abandon entirely to reason the settlement of questions which have been already decided by a divine revelation.

It is a somewhat curious fact that those who are most clamorous in asserting the independence and supremacy of individual reason, and who protest most vehemently against the influence of authority, would scarce consent to have the doctrine for which they stand up so stoutly, carried out in any other practical affair of life, except the important affair of religion alone. If, in legal matters, an irreversible decision had once been issued by a supreme court, who would overlook it, and stake his property in a precisely similar case upon the advice of a lawyer, however subtle and ingenious, who is known to disregard all precedents, and to trust entirely to the first principles of his science? If under a certain form of government the people are sure to continue happy, and prosperous, and free, who would tolerate an experiment in political metaphysics that would ignore the constitutional law and history of the country, and make each successive administration rule it according to their own peculiar set of first principles? It is the same with regard to the science of healing; let a really successful mode of treating a disease be once made known, and what practitioner will dare to forget it, and trust his reputation to first principles? And yet we are told that though God Himself has condescended

to give us a means of avoiding error in the most important subjects that can engage the attention of man; it is perfectly safe, prudent, nay, a duty to set aside those means, and confide unreservedly to first principles. Why not say boldly at once that a wrong conclusion concerning the Nature of the Divine Being is *not* an affair of such great moment? Why not proclaim that it is an evil of less tremendous magnitude to hold any one form of Pantheism, than to suffer loss of property, or be open to a charge of professional or administrative incapacity? And surely it is not because those questions which relate to the attributes of God, involve less mystery, or are beset with less difficulty than questions appertaining to the ordinary business of life, that we can afford in the examination of them to dispense with the salutary aid which has been placed within our reach. Take any one of the doctrines which form the usual matter for metaphysical discussion; and see how unaided reason will deal with it apart from revelation. Take, for example, the doctrine that the world has been created. We are taught to believe that the Almighty not only arranged the universe, and established the order and harmony thereof, but that by His word He produced the very material of it. Until He spoke it had not existed at all,—neither the form nor the matter,—neither in the rude mass nor arrayed in its present harmony and grandeur.

This is an elementary doctrine known to every Catholic child who has come to the years of understanding; but what was the notion on the same subject entertained by the “worshippers of human reason” renowned in antiquity? One great sage tells us that the world had always existed, and that the order seen in it had sprung from a generative principle within itself, and this principle was no more or less than moisture. Another gravely informs us that this view is correct, except that instead of assigning moisture as the enforming principle, we should assign heat. A third proclaims that the principle is neither moisture nor heat, but number. A fourth solemnly declares that this world is not the work of gods or men, but was, and is, and shall continue to be, an ever-living fire. Now, to a Christian, who has been listening to the true doctrine on this subject from childhood, and on whose mind a thousand unperceived influences have contributed to impress it as a familiar, and as it were, household

thought, such theories as the above will sound strange and unmeaning; and he will probably be led to say at once that his own reason could do something better,—that he would never dream of falling into such absurdities. But if individual reason of itself be now capable of something better than was the reason of Thales or Anaxagoras, the same superiority will scarce be claimed for the mental powers of a modern philosopher compared with those of Plato. And yet it seems that the idea of the world's creation but once dimly crossed Plato's mind, and the nearest approach which he made to truth on the question was, that matter had not been produced, but in the beginning spontaneously presented itself to the Divine Artificer to be moulded by His hand. Thus the real character of the relation in which God stands to the universe had scarce ever occurred to a single man among all the deep thinkers and acute reasoners of antiquity; much less could the most transcendent mind come by its own powers to a right conclusion concerning the true nature of the divine attributes. Imagine a philosopher who professes to ignore revealed truth, trying to reconcile the permission of evil with infinite sanctity and goodness, reasoning about a Being enduring for ever, yet never older, never younger—an Indivisible Presence which fills the whole universe, and yet is complete and entire in every part of it,—a Will perfectly free, and yet exempt from the possibility of change. Let the strongest intellect proceed to speculate upon such subjects, trusting to reason alone, resolved honestly to push first principles to their extreme limit, not caring a jot for the doctrine which has been revealed to the Church on the same subjects, whether it be opposed to, or in accordance with the conclusions of stern logic, we will not say that it is impossible for it to avoid error, but it assuredly incurs an imminent and dreadful risk of falling into it.

In further proof of the incapability of reason (without the aid of revealed truth), to deal adequately, or even securely with such abstruse questions as we have been referring to, we might dwell at much length upon the numberless errors and inconsistencies and contradictions which may be daily and hourly laid to the account of that faculty. Is it not, moreover, proverbially difficult to find two men, even the most enlightened as well as the most candid, concur in taking the same view on any topic? Nay, how

often does not the same man change and reverse his own best weighed judgments and most deliberate conclusions? At all events, if we listen for a moment to those who are fond of pronouncing eulogies upon the power and dignity of reason, we shall find that they most commonly speak of it as an abstract, impersonal kind of thing, and not as it actually appears in individual men, inheriting each his own proportion of the weakness, the passion, the prejudice of his race. They speak of it much in the same way as you hear men speak of the beauty and symmetry of the human form; what they so much extol is in truth a certain type or standard of their own conceiving, not at all the figure which actually walks by on the streets, and which, as the case may turn out, is sometimes tall, sometimes short, sometimes lean, sometimes bloated, sometimes athletic, sometimes worn and weak, sometimes whole, sometimes maimed, &c. Descartes' method has long appeared to us to rest upon an assumption that man's intellect is more excellent and perfect than it is in reality. He claims for it an inherent strength and inerrancy which experience proves that it does not possess. Overlooking the infirmities which actually beset it, he would fain invest it with ideal dignity and power. The darkness which original sin left upon it, the influence of pride, of prejudice, of association, habit, of these and such like obstacles to a secure and thorough investigation of truth, he either makes no account at all, or imagines that they are mere accidents, from which a disciplined philosophic mind may enjoy a complete immunity. *Cato bene sentit, sed loquitur tanquam in republica Platonis, non in fœce Romuli.* This tendency to exaggerate the natural force of the intellect is sometimes strongly, indeed, we may say, ludicrously illustrated in Descartes' own speculations; it betrays itself even in the discourse on method, which, from its aim, should have been a model of severe analysis. Every student of philosophy is acquainted with the process by which Descartes alleges that he arrived at a satisfactory solution of that mysterious, ever-recurring question, so often asked and never answered, namely, what is the foundation of knowledge, the ultimate guarantee of conviction—the ultimate test—criterion—proof—assurance—of truth? He tells us that he began by a resolution to doubt about everything—even about what had previously been regarded by him as possessing the most indisputable

claims to assent; he would take the whole frame-work of his mind to pieces, and not admit the existence even of the fragments; all that he had known or believed from childhood upwards, (his faith as a Catholic alone excepted) he would look upon as a tissue of groundless prejudices; his intellect was to be reduced to the condition of a mere *tabula rasa*, in which he would leave neither axiom nor postulate, premiss nor conclusion; nay, further, no stray association should be allowed to retain a lurking place in memory;—there was to be neither hope nor fear, pleasure nor pain, nor emotion nor passion, but the “*je pense*” was to stand alone in the soul, more solitary than the last man amid the universal wreck of things. In alluding to this celebrated analysis we do not care to repeat the taunting criticism of Gassendi; but the analysis, it seems to us indicates a confidence in the power of man’s mind over its own thoughts, which is scarce warranted by experience. Is any man really capable of going through such a mental process, as that by which Descartes declares that himself was enabled to discover the true starting point of philosophy? Is any man really capable of reviewing the different items which compose the sum of his knowledge, and of seriously persuading himself that they are all false or doubtful? Is any mind, however powerful, however severely disciplined and inured to habits of concentration, capable of dealing so despotically with itself and its own thoughts? One may abstract, may fix his attention on a single point, and direct his collected energies to the consideration of a single question, but to discard all our knowledge as false or doubtful, and be convinced ourselves that it is so, we hold to be an undertaking little less difficult of accomplishment than an attempt to blow away the atmosphere which surrounds us. Descartes’ method of arriving at the “*ego cogito*” appears in its way to be much the same as if he had had recourse to a surgical operation on the brain, for the purpose of establishing that laughable theory which he advances with such solemnity and confidence about the residence of the soul in the conarion.

But it was not in taking the initial doubt to be of such singular facility that Descartes’ reliance on the strength and capabilities of individual reason most glaringly betrays itself. It is when he sets about accounting a priori for the order and design of the universe that his presump-

tion, for so we must call it, becomes painfully conspicuous. How much thought, how much toil, how many years of patient inquiry, were necessary to give us the little knowledge of nature which we possess? There was the great book open from the beginning to the inspection of mankind, and who has ever yet, after the most assiduous attention, succeeded in reading a single page, so as to understand its full meaning? Suppose one man to enjoy all the advantages derivable from the accumulated experience of ages, and to have combined in himself all the knowledge acquired by observation, or experience, or induction, how far would he not be from comprehending the plan of the universe? But Descartes absolutely maintained that he not only understood that plan, but that he could himself have suggested, originated it; out of his own brain, without model or pattern of any description, he could weave a scheme of the universe, not merely as beautiful, as harmonious, as perfect as the present,—but he would undertake to devise one identical in every respect with the present, precisely resembling the present in all things from the relative position of the stars down to the tints of the flowers. Did we not know that Descartes was far from intending it irreverently, we should characterize such audacity as profane. The wisdom displayed in the works of creation has ever been looked upon as divine, and no human intellect can fathom, much less rival or compete with it. But Descartes, in his overweening reliance upon the power of reason, would have undertaken of himself to suggest the order of the heavens; he would have entered into the depths of the sea, and walked on the lowest parts of the deep; he would have made a weight for the winds, and weighed the waters by measure; he would have given a law for the rain, and a way for the sounding storm. In the whole history of science we remember nothing so sublimely ludicrous as Descartes' earnest, coolly-spoken invitation to his readers to accompany him to chaos, and be witnesses of the successful way in which *he* should proceed to the construction and arrangement of the world,—how *he* should establish the laws which govern it, and provide for their permanent harmonious operation. And be it observed, that for accomplishing this he required no exemplar, no archetype, in short, no other data beyond the “*ego cogito.*” Out of this magical “*je pense*” he would evolve a complete

design of the universe, just as Pascal is said to have deduced nearly a book of Euclid from a single axiom which he chanced to have overheard from his father,—or as Cuvier could faithfully sketch the organization, and estimate the dimensions of, a Saurian from the fragment of a tooth, or a stray vestige left by the tip of its tail.

The Cartesian demonstration of the existence of God is almost as celebrated as the Cartesian doubt, and illustrates significantly enough the danger to which, in metaphysical pursuits, the acutest mind may expose itself, when it ventures to trust implicitly to its own resources, overlooking the landmarks which traditional authority may have erected for its safe guidance. Descartes was not satisfied with the argument for the existence of a Supreme Being, founded upon the marks of design which are displayed in the universe. How could he, indeed, have accepted it, holding as he did that he could himself have accounted *à priori* for the number and magnitude and relative position of the stars, that he could have marshalled the hosts of heaven, and guided the earth in its orbit,—that he could have bound together the Pleiades and stopped the turning of Arcturus. In fact, according to the Cartesian system, our acquaintance with the existence of the external world, and, therefore, with the harmony of design which characterizes it should, in the order of strict logical sequence, follow and not precede our knowledge of the existence of God. Without presupposing the veraciousness of the Deity, it would, from the Cartesian point of view, be impossible to establish the existence of an external world. Hence a rigid demonstration of the existence of God was to form the key-stone of the new philosophy; without it we could not be scientifically certain of more than one or two elementary propositions; without this the chain of Osiris would remain for ever broken, and no hand could bind it. The preliminary argument was to be not only the basis of philosophy, it was, moreover, indispensable to theology, and without it the evidences of revealed religion would lose all their force. Addressing the Sorbonne on this subject, Descartes, in the Introduction to the Meditations, observes, “I have always been of opinion that the two questions respecting God and the soul were the chief of those that ought to be determined by help of philosophy rather than of theology; for, although to us, the faithful, it be suffi-

cient to hold as matters of faith, that the human soul does not perish with the body, and that God exists; it yet assuredly seems impossible ever to persuade infidels of the reality of any religion, or almost even any moral virtue, unless first of all these two things be proved to them by natural reason." The justness of this remark is clear and incontrovertible. Before it becomes imperative to accept revealed truth, an infidel must not only be convinced that the source from which it emanated is worthy of respect, but that it is divine, and from the nature of the thing entitled to all homage and obedience. 'This conviction it is impossible for him to have, unless he may be previously persuaded in some way or other that God exists,—nay, it is impossible without at least some vague notion of the divine nature and perfections. Hence Descartes could not but feel that in his system a great deal was made to depend upon the validity of the arguments which should be adduced to demonstrate the existence of God. In point of fact, he maintained himself that all certainty depended upon it,—that if it failed we could not proceed a single step in the discussion of natural truth, or in examining the evidences of revealed truth, and that in short it was the only answer to scepticism—the only breakwater against a universal deluge of doubt and infidelity. It is no wonder, therefore, that he speaks of it with so much confidence and complacency. "But I treated the first and chief (the arguments for the existence of God) in such a manner that I should venture now to propose them as demonstrations of the *highest certainty and evidence*. And I will also add that they are such as to lead me to think that *there is no way open to the mind of man by which proofs superior to them* can now be discovered." Simple people are fond of imagining that the evidence of God's existence, as seen in the works of creation, forces itself upon the mind—that it almost anticipates argument, and that it is impossible for any one who is not an idiot to be unconvinced by it after a moment's reflection. Indeed, we believe that such evidence is found everywhere, and in everything, in the lowest flower of the field no less than in the stars of heaven, in the organism of the meanest insect no less than in the noblest form and most glorious intellect,—in the teeming life that animates a single drop of water, as well as in the magnificence of a thousand suns and a thousand systems. It is not, how-

ever, upon the argument from the marks of design, from the traces of infinite wisdom and power which everywhere pervade the universe that Descartes proceeds; he even tells us that this argument must be regarded as a fallacy—a *petitio principii*, unless the existence of a Deity is first incontestably established by the argument which *he* suggests. And now, what is the value of this famous Cartesian argument, so much spoken of, so much vaunted, and involving consequences so momentous,—that if it be set aside its author fancies that the search after truth is vain—that nothing remains for us but scepticism and intellectual despair? It is well-known that St. Anselm of Canterbury is commonly reputed to be the first metaphysician who proposed it, though Suarez remarks that St. Anselm was certainly indebted for it to a passage in the writings of St. Augustine. Whether Descartes borrowed it from St. Anselm, or the Schoolmen, or whether by a strange but happy coincidence he originated it for himself, it is an argument which, if not for its intrinsic force, at least because of the venerable names associated with it in the history of philosophy, is doubtless entitled to some consideration. We will not, therefore, presume to say that it is a palpable sophism, the more especially as, by a very slight emendation it may be reduced to the form of the ontological argument for the existence of God, which is at present put forward with such singular emphasis by some of the most profound Catholic thinkers, and in some of the most distinguished Catholic Schools of the Continent. But when we recollect that it had been examined and rejected when St. Anselm first proposed it, by the most penetrating mind then or since employed in the service of the Church—if we turn it over ourselves, and make it the subject of our meditation, we shall find it so hard to appreciate it—to get over the suspicion that there is a fallacy lurking in it, though we may not be able to detect and clearly point it out; if we listen to the pronouncement of all the modern schools peremptorily discarding it, and studiously drawing a distinction between it and what might seem to be a similar argument used by some of themselves; and if on the other side we revert to the prominent position which it holds in the Cartesian system—the high irresistible evidence on which it is there said to rest, and the all-important consequences which are there made to depend upon its validity, we shall discover in

the history of this single argument quite enough to convince us how easy it is for the most sagacious intellect, when left entirely to itself, to mistake an uncertainty for "the highest certainty and evidence," to urge a fallacy for a demonstration more cogent than which "the mind of man cannot discover,"—and this on a subject which was understood to involve the best interests of religion and science. We might go on to adduce almost every one of Descartes' peculiar doctrines and views to show the peril of confiding too unreservedly in the direction of individual reason—determined to follow, wherever it may lead, over the wide sea of thought, without caring to seek for other guidance, or to consult the chart of revealed truth. If the Cartesian method be right—if the capabilities of reason be such as that method assumes them to be, is it not strange that scarce a single tenet or idea which the great philosopher could claim as his own has been able to withstand the test of time? The columns of the temple which he erected, and which was to last for ever, affording beneath its expansive dome a meeting-place for all the jarring sects and schools, have long since fallen and crumbled. His vaunted proof for the great dogma of a future state, and the immortality of the soul is universally rejected; it is not fit to convince an unbeliever—or to bear the slightest examination. It is less ingenious, and less solid than the proof for the existence of God. His theory concerning the origin of ideas (for, notwithstanding the authority of Sir William Hamilton, we must say, *cum pace tanti viri*, that Descartes *did* hold the doctrine of innate ideas,) was demolished by Locke, and is completely exploded. In fact, Descartes' claims to intellectual sovereignty, even in that department of knowledge in which himself thought his pre-eminence most secure, are admitted to rest entirely upon the peculiarity of the method which he invented. The application of that method, in his own hands, was almost always a failure. It would not be well for him if the inherent soundness of any one of his speculations, or their value in the aggregate, should be taken as the measure of his genius. Among his most zealous admirers and partizans, it is not denied that if mankind be at all indebted to him, it is rather because he induced them to depart from the beaten track, because he gave a new impulse and a new direction to thought, than because of his actual success in the

establishment of known truths, or in the discovery of truths not known.

While thus animadverting upon the failure of the Cartesian method, as applied by the great man who first promulgated it, we do not forget that the history of science records numberless instances of a similar kind—where a new principle, which was afterwards to be made available in achieving the most extraordinary triumphs, had been either misapplied, or proved totally inefficient in the hands of its discoverer. In mechanics, in astronomy, in chemistry, the men who were the first to point out the right path, were not always the most successful in following it. Scientific truth does not become complete at once—it has its seed-time and its harvest, its twilight and its noon-day. We shall therefore be told perhaps that it is unfair to take Descartes' own application of his method as a test of its soundness—that if we are determined to estimate it by its results, we should extend our inquiry and ascertain its influence upon the speculations of his followers—and of his school. And who, it may be further asked, are those followers,—who are the most distinguished disciples in the school of Descartes?—Will a Catholic writer take exception to their arguments or doctrines in reference to the Divine Attributes, or on either of the other two questions we have been all along speaking of? This is the philosophical school, is it not, whose opinions were adopted and vindicated by men whose memory is revered for holiness and learning throughout the world—and whose names are identified with the glory of the Church in France? Who could take the place of Bossuet, as watchman in the towers of Israel, or accuse him of want of vigilance in guarding the purity of faith; and for deference to authority, who could look for anything more beautiful and touching than the submissive spirit of Fenelon? And yet were not those, and a thousand others conspicuous for piety and zeal, devoted adherents to the philosophical views of Descartes?

Now, this is a line of observation in itself quite just, but altogether irrelevant if it should be advanced in defence of the Cartesian method, not as that method might possibly be interpreted and turned to good account in Catholic hands, but as it has since Descartes' time been usually understood in the popular schools of philosophy. In adverting to its failure, when applied by Descartes himself,

we had not forgotten so elementary a lesson as that the author of a new principle may not always attain complete success in its development. But this, as we take it, is a truism rather in the history of physical science than in natural theology. In the one, the law for obvious reasons is progress, as each new experiment and each fresh discussion afford additional data for arriving at a knowledge of truth; while in the other, if we abstract from what has been made known to us by revelation, the means of coming to a correct solution of any one problem, are scarce more enlarged at the present day than they had been two thousand years ago. It is for this reason that we have not considered it unfair to test the Cartesian principle by the use which its author himself made of it,—he having all the facilities for correct speculation possessed by the most favoured of his disciples, and the philosophic temperament being scarce less strongly marked, or the power of logical analysis less strikingly developed in him than in his successors. In truth, if the questions concerning God and the soul were in reality to be determined by individual reason alone, we hold that Thales or Anaxagoras, not to speak of a modern philosopher like Descartes, were quite as competent to appreciate the value of an argument on the subject as, let us say, a professor in the London University.

For the rest, we are not insensible to the merits of the illustrious men who rose up as stars in the French Church during the seventeenth century, and who have left behind them a trail of glory and of light for ever. But they, we maintain, and indeed the matter is obvious, never consented to ignore the authority of the Church in philosophical discussions. They always assume the revealed doctrine as the only true one; and then, where reason could in anywise confirm it, they made natural reason work well in the service of the Church. Accordingly, we shall find that the conclusions arrived at on the same subject by other men, with intellectual gifts scarce inferior, but who cared not to be guided by revelation, stand out in melancholy contrast to theirs. We shall not dwell here upon the systems of philosophy which Spinoza and a host of others professed to have evolved from the Method of Descartes; but we shall be content with allowing a rapid review of the leading philosophical schools which have grown up since Descartes' time, and which have

commanded public attention at home, and on the Continent, speak each for itself, in illustration of the principle of ignoring revealed truth in philosophical matters.

The Sensational School, as it has been called, may be regarded as the first which appeared in an independent and definite shape, to arrest our attention. In the history of philosophy it extends over a lengthened period, and occupies a conspicuous position. Locke is generally reputed the founder of it. The leading tenets of the school, however, as well as the principles on which they are based, had been broached and discussed by Hobbes, but being avowedly used by him as subsidiary to the re-establishment of views inimical to the interests of religion and society, they failed for a time to obtain popularity or consideration. Bacon, too, had been sounding the trumpet and preparing the way for the introduction and triumph of this school. Though he nowhere openly declares that the senses alone constitute the source of all our reliable knowledge, the tendency of his speculations and the weight of his authority, if they are not too clearly on the side of that opinion, may at least be easily perverted to foster and propagate it. The Sensationalists, at all events, have been fond of quoting the sarcastic dictum from the *Organum*, and applying it to what they looked upon as the airy, abstract, fruitless subtleties of their opponents: "*Pro desperanda autem habenda est causa veritatis cum ad talia inania deflectit.*" It is certain that the opinions formally propounded by Locke, and elaborated by him into a compact definite system, had long been ripening in the minds of men devoted to philosophical pursuits,—and we fancy that we are not far wide of the truth in saying that it was in no small degree owing to this circumstance, namely, that his views appeared in an auspicious conjuncture when they were but a reflex and expression of thoughts which had been already familiarly pondered over, that the celebrated essay became so famous. In the work itself, we look in vain for depth, or originality, or for any of the traces of a profound masterly intellect, unless, perhaps, such traces are to be found in a steady acuteness, always sharp as a blade, but accompanied neither by the brilliant imagination, nor graceful style which distinguish other worthies who rank far below Locke in the estimation of his countrymen. Locke himself did not profess to be a thorough-going

Sensationalist. Our knowledge, he maintained, was traceable to a double source—the senses and reflexion, both of which exercised a co-ordinate independent influence in the formation of it. But to suit the spirit of the time in which he wrote, it was expedient to dwell exclusively upon the first of these two elements, and Locke accordingly either does not allude at all to the share which reflexion has in the formation of our knowledge,—or he brings the matter out in so lame, inconsistent, self-contradictory a way, that his disciples, urging his principles to their legitimate consequences, justly inferred that we are indebted for all knowledge, properly so called, to the senses alone. Hence they would abolish the distinction between necessary and empirical truth, or rather they would altogether ignore the former, contending that whatever transcends experience is unsusceptible of scientific proof. Locke maintained that our idea of space is had through the sense of sight and touch,—our idea of solidity from the touch alone;—so also our idea of substance, of power, and cause, is had through the senses. If this be the way by which we come to have these ideas—if this be an adequate analysis of their origin—if they be but mere fragments of our experience, it is plainly illogical, a mere arbitrary assumption, to attribute to them when they occur in propositions, universality, or necessity. Whatever has no higher warranty for its truth than experience—whether individual experience, or the traditional experience of mankind cannot, it is obvious, be *therefore* assumed as *necessarily* and *universally* true. Yet Locke did with singular inconsistency assume propositions to be at once necessary and universal. He takes it as an axiom that every thing must have a cause,—he holds that no single particle of matter can be annihilated by any finite power,—he insists upon the *necessary* truth of geometrical propositions,—he lays it down that the resistance arising from solidity is absolutely insurmountable. If his own account of the origin of our knowledge that is derived from experience alone be the correct one, then surely he is not entitled to make such assertions. He should have written as a salvo after each of them—as far as *our experience justifies us in saying—as far as we have tried*. We have no instance of a change without a cause,—we have no *example* of a particle of matter annihilated by any finite agency; and so on; but beyond this we cannot venture to give a decision—

we have nothing but experience to guide us about the absolute possibility or impossibility of the thing; it would not, therefore, become us to speculate upon it. It was some such line of argument as this that was adopted by Locke himself when he maintained that the human soul, with all its powers and faculties, with its subtle thoughts, its imagination, its liberty, could not be proved to be an immaterial substance, and that there is no repugnance in the supposition that it is but an animated clod. In the discussion concerning the nature of the human soul as known to us by the light of reason, Locke, for once, did not swerve from his principles; and his disciples with a degree of consistency which could scarce have been prompted by his example, were resolved to carry those principles still further. Condillac was the ablest as well as the most intrepid of all his followers. Assuming the correctness of Locke's theory, that the senses are to be regarded as the exclusive source of our knowledge, he adopted a curt, pointed, emphatic way of stating the entire doctrine. In a sentence that has since become celebrated for terseness and comprehensive meaning, he declared that "all ideas are but transformed sensations," and insisted that this was the true authentic exposition of Locke's views. In plainer words, he advocated a system of undisguised materialism; he held it to be an inevitable corollary from the teaching of his English master and guide, that there was no more a spiritual principle in man than in a statue, nothing in short but delicately wrought fibres, and an elaborately contrived organization. Such is the historical origin of a school of Philosophy, from which, in modern times, the Church, the depository of revealed truth, has suffered much. It rose up a cold, unsightly hideous thing, its evil mission being to make war against faith. It stood in the highways, blaspheming God and His holy religion, proclaiming night and day that the world was but a vast self-arranged machine, containing within its own bosom the springs of such order and harmony as it exhibited,—that it was frivolous to talk of a Supreme Intelligence—of a Providence—of a hereafter—of any thing that we cannot see or touch. In this school Hume was the foremost man—Hartley and Priestly belonged to it. Helvetius and Lord Shaftesbury dictated its ethics; D'Alembert, in the Introduction to the Encyclopedia, became its champion when a temporary reaction seemed to set in against it,

and with the aid of his colleagues restored its popularity in France. In our time the recognised exponent, and most celebrated advocate of the doctrines of this school is M. Auguste Comte. By the most competent judges it is held that he has not pushed the principles of the school beyond the limits to which he was justified in urging them, and that his system of positivism, as he has been pleased to designate it, is no more than a strict logical development and intrepid application of a theory for the author of which Englishmen have often twined garlands, and chanted hymns of praise. The first volume of M. Comte's *Cours de Philosophie Positive*, appeared in 1830; the second was published five years afterwards, others followed in 1838, and subsequently. The design which the writer modestly proposes is to remodel society in its manifold relations and aspects; and science is the means by which he would accomplish this regeneration. All the sciences, he maintains, whether physical or social, or religious, are to be treated as branches of one science, and are therefore to be investigated on one and the same method. He then proceeds to state that the history of each department of knowledge is marked by three distinct progressive phases, that is, every science passes through three different states,—it is first *theological*, secondly *metaphysical*, then in its last and perfect state it becomes *positive*. The theological period corresponds with the infancy, that is, with the extremely rude unenlightened condition of mankind, the metaphysical stage represents its youth, but the grand era of positivism inaugurated by M. Comte, coincides with its mature age, and grave deep-thinking manhood. In the theological period, he goes on, men knew not how, to be content with observing phenomena as they appeared—they should trace effects to causes, they could not account for the way in which the world came to be clothed with beauty and order—and how it is that its harmony has been preserved unbroken from the beginning but by the supposition that there must be a Supernatural Intelligence who planned the whole, and an Almighty hand that guides and preserves it. This was the untutored infancy of the human intellect, ere genuine science had yet scarce begun to dawn upon them. Men were then simple enough to admit the existence of God, to fear His wrath, and imagine it was a terrible thing to fall into His hands. The metaphysical period, according to M.

Comte, is a decided advance, and affords palpable indications of sounder thought and superior enlightenment when compared with the theological. In this epoch, the existence of God, or of any supernatural agency is not insisted upon; but a remnant of the old theological prejudice still distinguishes it, and induces the speculator to seek for occult natural causes, for abstract forces, real entities, and so on, and to substitute these for the Deity. This mode of proceeding also argues a certain weakness and immaturity of intellect; it shows that science was still in the chrysalis, though rapidly approaching to the term of its transformation. It was reserved for M. Comte to usher in the new era, to be the guardian of philosophy at a time when, having discarded the fanciful conceits of youth, and risen above the vain, restless curiosity of childhood, it should walk upon the earth, scaring error and superstition before its awful brow. In this new system we are not to believe in the existence of God, as a Supreme Being, distinct from or elevated above physical nature; we are not to believe that the soul of man is a spiritual substance, as that phrase is commonly understood by Catholics; we are not to believe in a hereafter; we are not to believe in the existence of moral duty, or at least, that moral duty springs from the high source to which it is referred by the Church. M. Comte himself tells us with an undisguised air of triumph that on Sunday, the 19th of October, 1851, he closed a course of lectures in the Palais-Cardinal, after a *resumé* of five hours in this fashion: “*Au nom du passé et de l’avenir, les serviteurs théoriques et les serviteurs pratiques de l’humanité viennent prendre dignement la direction générale des affaires terrestres, pour construire enfin la vraie providence, morale, intellectuelle, et matérielle, en excluant irrévocablement de la suprématie politique, tous les divers esclaves de Dieu, comme étant à la fois arriérés et perturbateurs.*” In confirmation of the doctrine in favour of which M. Comte urges this extraordinary appeal, he confidently refers each of his hearers and readers to his own individual experience. “There is none of us,” he says, “who, looking back upon his own personal history, does not at once remember that in childhood he admitted the existence of a Deity; in more advanced youth he became a searcher after occult natural causes to explain phenomena, but that in ripe manhood, he denied both the one and the other. And the man,” he adds, “who cannot

verify this from his own recollections *is not up to the level of the time.*”

Now, we know that from such blasphemous rhodomontade as this a Catholic mind will recoil with instinctive horror. A Catholic will say that it should scarce be transcribed, if the very statement of it were not an abundant exposure of its absurdity. How, he will ask, could such a doctrine be patiently listened to for a moment? What danger that it should ever secure a favourable reception among men, brought up from childhood as Christians? Who can tolerate it? Would it not rob us of faith and sweetest hope? It would not only remove God to an inaccessible distance from His creatures, but it would leave them no God, no Redeemer, no Providence, no Father, with His divine ears ever attentive to receive their petitions, and His bountiful hand ever open to supply their wants, and surround them with blessings. Besides, it may be remarked, is not a theory of this kind as extravagant and ridiculous as it is impious? It is no less a libel upon common sense than an impotent effort to overthrow religion. If the Church had never been established, or if her voice were silent for ever, who could fail to see through such transparent nonsense? Revelation is not required to set one right in this affair, it is too grossly, too revoltingly absurd; it comes from the same school whence have issued those insane declamations concerning society, progress, the heart and pulse of humanity, et cetera, which have provoked the laughter of the whole world.

Yes, but these same insane demon-inspired oracles have also occasioned copious and bitter tears. Everywhere there are sad traces and painful recollections of their evil influence. It is well for those who, led by duty, or taste, or accident, or from whatever cause, to an acquaintance with such philosophical theories as the one we have now spoken of, are enabled to pursue the study of it at the feet of our holy mother, the Church. With her light beaming upon us and around us, with her kind voice whispering in our ear, the *monstra erroris* cannot hide their deformity. In her company, we are sure not to stray from the right path. Like the heavenly guardian sent to direct Tobias, we shall ever find her, when we want to be directed, beautiful, standing girded, and, as it were, ready to walk. And she knows the way that leadeth to the country of the Medes, and hath often walked through all the ways thereof, and

she will conduct us safe, and bring us again safe. But it would be a grave mistake to suppose that persons outside the Church take the same view of these matters as ourselves. We should hope that there are few professing to be Christians, who, if the practical *conclusions* of such a theory as Comte's were markedly stated to them, would not instantly reject them. But a student of philosophy is obliged to go through a certain preliminary routine before he comes to hear of the conclusions. He first studies the principles, and it is not easy to disprove clearly the principles advocated by Locke in his great essay. He finds that they have been taken up and defended by illustrious men, and that they have been sustained by arguments in which he cannot perceive a flaw. He goes on to examine some of the propositions deduced from them; the logical process is perfect, he must accept the propositions also. He comes at length upon a complete philosophical system like Comte's. We have no less an authority than Dr. Whewell assuring us, though he has no sympathy with Comte's views, that they are in the main evolved conformably to the most rigid laws of analysis from the principles of Locke. What, then, shall our youthful student do? He has been taught to ignore the Church and revealed truth in philosophical questions; he cannot, therefore, fall back upon revealed truth to check the wrong inferences he has been drawn into; he cannot, like a Catholic, appeal to that standard which would at once inform him, that however acute and specious the reasoning, the conclusion must be false and impious.

Those who fancy that the very absurdity of certain doctrines is a sufficient guarantee that they cannot become popular, who think that a man's good sense will instinctively reject them, and that no ecclesiastical or theological aid whatever is necessary to shield the mind from their influence, are at times apt to forget that such doctrines are commonly proposed for acceptance in a plausible, dazzling, insidious fashion. They are scarce ever advanced in the direct, plain, open way, which might be likely to make a Christian turn from them at once with abhorrence. And as they are seldom stated only in a dry formal manner, so they are never abandoned to the support of mere school logic. Every branch of science, and every walk of literature, are gradually made to illustrate them and contribute to their diffusion. The design is not that the evil

thing should appear suddenly in its deformity, and alarm conscience, but that in due course it should insensibly arrest attention, soften, win, fascinate. Hence it soon puts off the unsightly vesture of the schools, and assumes all beautiful and attractive forms; it speaks to us in grand, lyric words; it is embodied in pleasant, graceful fiction; it inspires eloquence, that fills the young mind with rapture; it is backed by a coalition of grave sarcasm and laughing wit; it lays claim to universal knowledge, and talks loudly of having submitted everything to severe proof; it is the only true friend of liberty and humanity—nay, of religion; it will regenerate the human race; and, in short, make those who taste of the fruit which it points out, to become as gods. When Catholics hear of the preposterous, debasing doctrines, which have, from time to time, obtained popularity among masses of men, they can scarce explain the phenomenon in any other way than by supposing that the mind, as well as the body, is subject to the influence of sudden, unaccountable epidemics. Or, rather, a Catholic looking at the practical consequences of such a philosophical system as we have been considering, is like a man who reads of the commission of gross crime, but cannot realize to himself the motives, the character, or force of the temptation which led to it. It never, therefore, perhaps, occurs to him that if he had himself been placed in the same circumstances, and assailed by the same temptation, he, too, instead of wondering how such a crime could have been thought of, might not have likewise fallen into it.

The principles of the Sensational School, though for a long period in the ascendant outside the Church, were occasionally combated even by men who did not think religion paramount to philosophy. In England, where, as we have seen, the school had its birth, it encountered from the commencement some learned and distinguished opponents, among whom we may mention Clarke. In France its popularity first began to decline in a marked way under the covert attacks of Laromiguière, who professed to be a disciple of Condillac, and since his time it had been steadily falling into disrepute—owing, in some measure, to the denunciations of Ampere and Cousin—until Comte brought his boundless knowledge and undoubted genius to aid in its revival.

But inside the German circles, the system never ob-

tained a great or permanent success ; if discussed there at all, it was only to be set down as an ignoble form of materialism, something alien to the national mind, a theory with which it was impossible for a true German to sympathize. From the university of Königsberg there issued, towards the close of the last century, another theory, based upon principles not merely different, but almost opposite, which was to supersede it at least for a time, and which, in its turn, was to be the creed of the Sophoi of Europe. We are told by Kant that his design in the “*Critic of Pure Reason*” was to refute the empirical scepticism of Hume. He held that Hume’s analysis of the way in which we come to have our ideas of active power and cause, had never been fairly met, nor a satisfactory explanation given of the origin of those ideas. “*Since the essays,*” says Kant, “*of Locke and Leibnitz, or rather since the origin of metaphysics, as far as their history extends, no circumstance has occurred which might have been more decisive of the fate of this science than the attack made upon it by David Hume.*” He proceeds upon a single but important idea in metaphysics, the connection of cause and effect, and the concomitant notions of power and action. He challenged reason to answer him what title she had to imagine that anything may be so constituted, as that if it be given, something else is also thereby inferred ; for the idea of cause denotes this. He proved, beyond contradiction, that it is impossible for reason to think of this, *à priori*, for it contains necessity, but it is not possible to perceive how, because something is, something else must necessarily be, nor how the idea of such a connection can be introduced *à priori*. I freely own it was these suggestions of Hume which first, many years ago, roused me from my dogmatical slumbers, and gave to my enquiries quite a different direction in the field of speculative philosophy.....I first enquired, therefore, whether Hume’s objection might not be a general one, and soon found that the idea of cause and effect is far from being the only one by which the understanding, *à priori*, thinks of the connection of things, but rather that the science of metaphysics is altogether founded upon these connections. I endeavoured to ascertain their number, and having succeeded in this attempt, I proceeded to the examination of those general ideas, which I was now convinced are not, as Hume apprehended,

derived from experience, but arise out of the pure understanding. This deduction, which seemed impossible to my acute predecessor, and which nobody besides him had ever conceived, although every one makes use of those ideas, without asking himself upon what their validity is founded; this deduction, I say, is the most difficult which could have been undertaken for the behoof of metaphysics; and what was still more embarrassing, metaphysics could not have offered me the smallest assistance, because that deduction ought first to establish the probability of a system of metaphysics. As I had now succeeded in the explanation of Hume's problem, not merely in a particular instance, but with a view of the whole power of pure reason, I could advance with sure, but tedious steps to determine completely, and upon general principles, the compass of pure reason, both what is the sphere of its exertion, and what are its limits, which was all that was required for erecting a system of metaphysics upon a proper and solid foundation." The change which Kant effected in mental philosophy, he himself proudly compares to the reform which Copernicus introduced in astronomy. Copernicus happily reversed the mathematical traditions concerning the motion of the heavenly bodies, and setting out from the hypothesis that this motion is apparent and not real, he promulgated a system of great beauty and simplicity, which fully explained all the phenomena that an astronomer undertakes to account for. A similar revolution was required, according to Kant, in order to produce a genuine philosophical system, a system of complete symmetry, and alone capable of demonstration. Accordingly, he begins by asserting that those ideas which constitute the foundation of metaphysical science cannot be shown to have any reality, any objective existence corresponding with them, and that they are purely subjective, *à priori* forms of the mind. Such are our ideas of possible and impossible, of infinite and finite, of cause and effect, of power and action, of the relation of numbers, of time, of space, of necessary and contingent, and so on. These ideas cannot be derived from experience, otherwise they should neither be unvariable nor universal. But though not derived from experience, they are not antecedent to it, and therefore not to be considered innate in the sense in which the doctrine of innate ideas has been attributed to Descartes. In point of time they

begin with experience, though they arise not from it, but from the mind itself. Whenever, then, a proposition has the character of universality and necessity, it must have received this character from the mind. We have no other guarantee that it is strictly necessary and universal than because the mind imparts to it that character. From the mental faculty, therefore, not from absolute objective truth and reality, this proposition, for example, every change must have a cause, derives its universality and necessity. Its truth, therefore, as a general proposition, is only apparent, we are not warranted in assuming that it is absolute, real. It is the same with all other propositions that have the character of necessity and universality, and, of course, with the conclusions deduced from them, their truth cannot be known as objective, absolute, real truth, but only as apparent and subjective. The intellect does not create the objects which it apprehends, but it induces upon them a certain form, certain conditions of its own making; it stands towards them in a relation somewhat analogous to that in which the eye views the many-coloured rainbow, every tint of which we imagine to hang above us in the heavens, though science tells us that its glorious hues are all in the eye, and arise out of its peculiar organization.

This is, in truth, the basis on which the entire of Kant's doctrine rests. It is, in many respects, different from idealism, particularly the idealism advocated by Berkley. The philosopher of Cloyne admitted the reality of things, and our capability of knowing them. Kant insists that we can know nothing, as it is *in se*, that we cannot, *e. g.*, know whether every change must have a cause, but only that it seems so to us, and if the mind were not constituted as it is, it might seem otherwise. Berkley did not hesitate to recognize the existence of noumena, on the contrary, he maintained that the mind stands face to face with them, perceives them immediately, and requires not the interposition of what are called sensations, ideas, intelligible species, or of a representative object of any kind to apprehend them. Kant retains the distinction between noumena and phenomenon, between truth *in se*, and truth *in ordine ad nos*; the latter only can we be certain of, but of the former we must for ever continue uncertain. Berkley's theory, at least in his own hands, is unquestionably dogmatic. Kant's so evidently leads to scepticism, that its

author himself was compelled to acknowledge that, in order to establish any proposition, we must abolish science and fall back upon credulity. In fact, Kant, though he professes to have set out chiefly with the intention of vindicating the principles of human knowledge from the attacks of Hume, comes to a conclusion virtually the same as that of the English philosophers; one says that our idea of cause and effect is to be traced to a habit of the mind, the other, that it arises from a law or form of the mind, but both equally deny our capability of knowing whether it be *in se* true that every change must have a cause.

It will be asked if a system of philosophy based upon such a foundation as this could have ever occupied the serious attention of rational creatures—could have ever succeeded in moulding opinion or conciliating sympathy—above all, if it could have ever had a practical influence upon the religious views of thinking men. It only opens, some one may say, an arena for the subtle weaving of cobwebs—not the ground on which the lynx-eyed enemies of faith would take their stand for battle. Who, outside his own lecture-hall at Königsberg, cares for the strange jargon, the uncouthly-worded paradoxes of Kant? Who has not common sense enough, without at all hearkening to the voice of the Church, to reject them?—nay, the man has no appreciation of the ridiculous, who can refrain from laughter at the old sophist's oracular air—his grotesque robes and cabalistic phrases. Well, it is not good to take the bread of the children and to cast it to the dogs. There is no better attested fact in history than that where divine faith has been abused,—those who forfeited the precious gift have been uniformly led, sooner or later, into the most monstrous, and to a Catholic, almost inconceivable errors on matters connected with the Nature of God, with moral duty, and a future life. The principles of Kant's philosophy may seem to us an outrage upon reason itself; but if we recollect that these principles furnished the basis on which was to be constructed a system of theology and morals, we may feel less surprise at the wide popularity to which they attained outside the Church. At all events, in whatever way we may account for the phenomenon—however intensely we may wonder at it, a system did grow up from those principles, and was permitted in the economy of Providence to lead astray a whole people—to

penetrate beyond the country which gave it birth, and win adherents among men of the acutest intellect,—to have everywhere in Europe its lecturers, its poets, its essayists, its fictionists—and to become the only religion admitted by thousands of cultivated minds. Some of our well disposed, enlightened Catholic countrymen, who imagine that the Church may at times be rather sensitive about the faith of her children, and inclined to exaggerate the dangers that beset it—would probably think that a philosophical theory like Kant's, might, without let or hindrance, be submitted for study or discussion to the judgment of any young man at the university,—and, in fact, in the absence of every theological corrective, be safely left to refute itself. We will take the liberty of briefly citing for them the criticism pronounced on Kant's psychological speculations, by one or two illustrious writers, who would scarce be less impatient of a glaring absurdity than these same Catholics, and who would certainly not be less slow in detecting it. Cousin, observing on the general character of Kant's philosophy, the great fundamental tenet of which we have fairly placed before the reader, introduces the subject in this way. It was reserved for Germany—that country distinguished for deep thought and meditation,—the country which had produced Leibnitz and Wolf, to give to Idealism its true representative and exponent in the eighteenth century; this representative is the illustrious Kant. Kant, as well as Locke, is a disciple of Descartes; his speculations are stamped with the same general character, and proceed on the same method as Locke's,—this character and this method being, in fact, the distinctive mark of modern philosophy. With a firm hand he separated philosophy from theology,—he made consciousness the starting point of his analysis,—and in this only did he differ from Locke, that the one takes the origin of our knowledge to be sense,—the other *à priori* ideas or forms of the mind.

Kant is indisputably the founder of a rational psychology.. Madame de Staël tells us that “at the period when Kant's ‘*Critic of Reason*’ was published, there had been two current systems of philosophy—the sensational and the ideal. Between these reason went on habitually straying till Kant undertook to define the boundaries of the two empires—of the senses and of

the mind—of the external and internal worlds. The intellectual power which he manifested in tracing these limits, had perhaps been unequalled among his predecessors.” It would be easy to collect a volume of panegyrics pronounced upon Kant by the savans of different countries, but the most unequivocal evidence of the value set upon the principles of his philosophy, is to be found in the enthusiasm with which they were taken up, and made to give a colour to every department of German science and literature. Kant himself, though he did not publish the “Critic” until after his life had been far advanced, lived to see a disciple, or proselyte to his views, in almost every university chair in his native country.

If a Catholic is unable to appreciate the fundamental principles of German philosophy, he will probably be still less tolerant of their development and application in the hands of Kant’s followers. The theories propounded by Fichte, Jacobi, Schelling, Hegel, each of whose names stands at the head of a separate and independent school, are scarce of a character to compensate, in a religious point of view, for the sceptical philosophy of Kant. The creed of them all consists of but one dogma, however differently they may word it, or attempt to establish it, and that is Pantheism. In a future number we propose, if the subject should be worth resuming, to place before our readers a more detailed account of their respective systems, as well as of that propounded in France by M. Cousin. For the present we must be content with observing that all the great modern Schools of Philosophy set up on the principle that individual reason is independent of authority, are, in spirit, and the tendency of their doctrines, one and the same as the ancient schools of Alexandria. The best of them do, in fact, glory in reproducing the very theories which Julian the Apostate delighted to ponder over, and which he opposed so vehemently to the simplicity of the Gospel. They cannot succeed now any more than they did then, for the truth of God remains for ever. Nay, in the character of these schools, and in the manner in which they have come to supersede almost every other form of religious error, Pantheism being, according even to such a writer as Mr. Rogers, the chief error of our time, it is not impossible to detect a good augury, the dawn of brighter days for the Church. For would it not seem that all the strength of the gates of hell has been tried

against her, that heresy has assailed her on every point that might appear vulnerable, and with every kind of weapon, that the enemy is now at last compelled to fall back upon precisely the same mode of attack which he adopted in the first age of her history, and she still rises before us amid opposition ever varying, like a cliff of granite amid clouds and winds?

In the preceding remarks we have been trying to establish the necessity of admitting the influence of authority in philosophical matters, but we have been compelled to confine the argument to a merely negative view of the subject; we have rather been pointing out the incompetence of reason, when depending on its own resources alone, to arrive at a safe conclusion on all those questions concerning the nature of God which are discussed in Metaphysics, than setting forth the positive claims which authority has to direct reason in the solution of them. However, even from the imperfect way in which we have been compelled to deal with the subject, we trust that we have made it sufficiently clear that it is extremely dangerous to faith to overlook or ignore revealed truth in the study of Philosophy.

ART. VIII.—*A Bill to Promote Education in England*, (prepared and brought in by LORD JOHN RUSSELL and MR. HASTINGS.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 8 February, 1855.

LITTLE, we fear, is known about the provisions of this Bill. It was ushered into existence at a time when other questions involving the fate of ministries, and therefore more interesting, if not more important, absorbed the public attention. We consequently may perhaps be usefully employed if we convey to our readers some brief explanation of the purport of this proposed measure. It is a peculiar Bill, peculiar in reference to the subject of Education which it proposes to place on a totally new

basis, and peculiar also in reference to the public character of those who introduce it, and, indeed, the consistency of public men in general, as it is diametrically opposed to the last previous propositions, and expressly contradicts the latest professions, of its authors. It is, indeed, the *worst* Bill on the subject of Education which has come under our notice. Of the many which have been ventilated during the last few years, whether proceeding from the Manchester and Salford Laboratory, or recommending itself by the title of the Public (or Secular) School system, whether propounded by Mr. W. J. Fox, or by Sir Harry Inglis, or ushered into brief existence by the government of the day, this, of all the schemes proposed by the various conflicting bodies intent on teaching, appears to us the very worst. It combines whatever in them can be found that is radically wrong in principle, with an organization or system of management which, if ever actually used for such a purpose, would not only damage education for the conduct of which it is unsuited, but would also interfere prejudicially with those other objects for which the organization in question was originally designed, and is both by nature and habit adapted. It admits of secular without religious education, and confides to such authorities as town councils and parish vestries the entire management, direction, and controul of a new set of schools, to be maintained by a public and general Education Rate. The provisions, indeed, of this Bill, on the back of which appears the name of Lord John Russell, are so contrary to everything previously propounded by his Lordship on the subject of Public Education in England, that we are inclined to doubt whether it really be Lord John Russell's Bill at all, and whether his name has not been lent, on the credit of others, to a scheme the real character of which he has yet to learn. We cannot suppose that there has recently occurred, not merely a change, but such a revolution in his Lordship's mind on the subject of education, as would be involved in his real approval of the enactments of this Bill, which is so utterly opposed to the purport of another measure on the same subject, which he introduced into parliament not quite two years ago. On the 4th April, 1853, Lord John Russell rose in the House of Commons to explain generally the intentions of the Government on the important subject of Education, and in so doing began by stating what had been the recent

course of proceeding with respect to the education of the poor in England. He passed in review the systems of Lancaster and Bell, of the British and Foreign School Society, and of the National School Society, and the Government plan for aiding in the education of the poor, through the medium of the Committee of Council on Education. He stated to the House the actual results as to the education of the poor, and it may be useful here to repeat his statistics.

“ He had received, only on the previous day, from the Registrar General a statement relative to the number of schools in this country, and of persons receiving education in them. The number of public day schools existing on the 31st of March, 1851, at the taking of the census, was 15,473 ; the number of persons belonging to the schools, or on the school books, was, males, 791,548, females, 616,021 ; attending at the schools on the 31st of March, males, 635,107, females, 480,130. The number of private day schools existing on the 31st of March, 1851, was 29,425 ; the number of persons belonging to the schools, or on the school books, was, males, 347,694, females, 353,210 ; attending at the schools on the 31st of March, males, 317,390, females, 322,349. The proportion of scholars on the books to the population, was equal to 11.76 per cent, or one scholar to $8\frac{1}{2}$ persons ; the proportion of scholars in attendance to scholars on the books was equal to 83 1-5th per cent. The sources of income are as follows :—Local endowments, £69,537, local subscriptions, £366,823, local collections, £114,109, school pence, £413,044, other sources, £83,076, private supporters, £54,000. There was one sum to which he was particularly desirous of calling the attention of the house, the item of £413,044 derived from school pence. He had no doubt the sum here given was below the actual amount, and that we should not err in excess if we were to set down £500,000 as the sum actually contributed in school pence. Now recollecting that half a century ago there were but Sunday Schools for the poor, the result of these efforts was striking, and likewise satisfactory. It induced him to *think that we ought to direct our efforts rather to strengthen and improve the system of education which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts, than to attempt to set up anything in its place*, which, while disturbing the existing system, might fail to supply an equal amount of money for the education of the poor.”

Thoroughly concurring in this last sentiment of his Lordship, we are surprised to find a completely new and different, and, as we presume to think, very objectionable element introduced in the present Bill, which might, and probably would, have the effect *not* of strengthening and

improving the system of education, which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts, but rather of setting up something in its place to disturb the existing system, the precise result deprecated by his Lordship in 1853.

The present Bill authorizes the

“ Council of any borough in England to submit to the Education Committee of the Privy Council a scheme for the promotion of education in such borough, whether by establishing and maintaining a new school or schools, or by aiding any existing school or schools with a view to extend the benefits thereof, or by both such means, showing the particulars of the school or schools so proposed to be established or aided respectively, and the rules proposed to be established or adopted for the government or management of such school or schools, including any rules in force which it is proposed to continue in any school to be so aided, with an estimate of the expenditure which will from time to time be required for such school or schools, in addition to any funds which the Council may have at its disposal, or which may be otherwise available for the proposed objects.”

Such scheme must have been adopted at a special council meeting, at which not less than two-thirds of the entire number of the council shall have been present.

“ In case the Education Committee of the Privy Council approve of such scheme, either with or without any alteration or modification, it shall be lawful for the borough council, by which the same has been submitted, to carry the same into effect.”

“ Such scheme and such rules may at any time be altered by the borough council with the approval of the said Education Committee, but not otherwise.”

To defray the expenditure incurred under this Act, *i.e.*, the costs of their scheme of Education, the Borough Council are authorized to levy a rate not exceeding 6d. in the pound, on all the rateable property in the Borough.

In order to extend the operation of the Bill to parishes not within any borough, one-fifth of the rate-payers of a parish, or at least 50 parishioners, may by requisition call upon the churchwardens to convene a meeting of rate-payers to decide upon the adoption or non-adoption of the act, which meeting the churchwardens are bound to convene, and two-thirds of the votes present at such meeting may decide in favour of the adoption of the act, if they be also a clear majority of the rate-payers of the parish.

When so adopted in any parish, the vestry of such parish may submit to the Educational Committee of the Privy Council a scheme for the promotion of Education in such parish (just, as the town council are previously authorized to do in the case of a borough), and the expenditure incurred under the act in any parish is to be defrayed according to the order of the vestry, by the Overseers out of the poor-rate, but not in any year to exceed sixpence in the pound on the rateable value of the property in the parish.

And the management of the schools both in and out of boroughs, is provided for by the following clause of the Bill, which we copy entire, lest it might be supposed that any inaccuracy had crept into our statement of its purport.

“The Council of any Borough, and the Vestry of any Parish acting under this act, shall have, by themselves, or by such School Committee, or other Committee as they may appoint, *the entire management, direction, and superintendence of the Schools to be established* OR AIDED *under this act by such Council or Vestry*, subject to the rights of any Trustees or special Visitors of any such Schools; but all Schools established or aided under this act, shall be subject to the inspection of any Inspector appointed by the said Education Committee.”

What will be the practical result of all these provisions and authorities, but, either that the act will become altogether nugatory by the schemes of town council or of vestry not obtaining the sanction of the Educational Committee of the Privy Council, or a thoroughly tyrannical and exclusive power will be given to the majority, for the time being, in the town council or the vestry? And, whatever else their result, they will introduce a new element of squabbling and quarrelling (which is quite needless) into the meetings of such municipal and parochial bodies. Within their proper sphere, and confined to their appropriate duties, these bodies are a very useful element of our internal organization, and as such, command our respect. Their disagreements usually arise from an inclination to travel beyond their proper boundaries into national or personal questions, from an ambition to exert a potency like that of Nasmyth's steam hammer, which can crunch a cannon or point a pin, and to determine alike and with the same absolute wisdom the affairs of the nation, and every petty individual right. If it were possible to suppose that this Bill could pass, and that the council of every borough

became thereby authorized to submit to the Privy Council a scheme for the promotion of Education therein, the effect, we feel assured, would be to spoil the Town Council, *as a Town Council*, without making them good managers of education. The education scheme would be an attractive topic ; withdrawing the attention of the worthy councillors from less exciting and less popular matters, they would talk very loosely and warmly, and at very great length, and at repeated meetings about it, and at last either party and prejudice would override reason and good sense ; or, to take even a more favourable view, their first errors might arise simply from zealous inexperience, and from their having been selected for any other kind of aptitude rather than for that of framing a scheme of education or managing a school. In subsequent years, however, the school question would become the great question upon which would depend the selection by each class of Burgesses of their representatives in the town council. A pledge by any candidate seeking municipal honours, to the popular view (whatever that might be) on Education, would weigh more than all his other qualifications, or disqualifications, put together. No matter how well fitted for all other local business, he would have no chance if not prepared to vote for that style of education which was in fashion at the moment. Municipal matters, properly so speaking, would become of secondary importance, and Education would become the subject of hot contention in every Borough in England. The Church of England men, the Dissenters, the Wesleyans, the Unitarians, the Secularists, the Socialists, (we fear the Catholics would have no chance,) would each labour to disseminate their own views on education through the medium of the town council, and every annual election would be a struggle for school ascendancy. We think it will be agreed that the introduction of such a system as proposed by this bill would effectually accomplish the double purpose of spoiling a good town council, and creating bad school managers.

Similar remarks will, of course, apply to parish vestries, but there usually the absolutism of one party and the exclusion of all others would be more complete.

Without, however, further urging our own ideas, we may quote the personal opinions of Lord John Russell, expressed by him in his place in Parliament, only two years ago, against the purport of the bill upon which his name

now happens to be endorsed. We have already seen how strongly and appropriately and with what good reason he said "that we ought to direct our efforts rather to strengthen and improve the system of education, which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts, than to attempt to set up anything in its place," yet the present bill gives the town council and parish vestry the power of attempting to do the very thing which His Lordship here says ought not to be done. These local bodies may seek, and nothing is more natural or more in accordance with the ordinary course of human nature, than for them to seek to establish some new system of education, far better in their judgment than any which they see in operation, of which they alone may enjoy the control and management, and which, sustained by a rate of sixpence in the pound, may soon starve all voluntary free schools in the place out of existence. Nothing is more probable than such a result as this, nothing more questionable than whether this would be any improvement. True, it may be remarked, that the Education Committee of the Privy Council would not be likely to sanction a scheme for establishing new schools to be managed by a town council or parish vestry, in opposition to good free schools, where such already existed in the locality. First of all, though we really have considerable confidence in the good judgment of the Education Committee of the Privy Council, we would rather not entrust to them or to any one the power of sanctioning what may be a positive mischief. But, assuming they will always use such a power discreetly, and will in all such cases refuse their sanction, the act will then become *just nugatory*. And why by the purport of your legislation set town councils and parish vestries to seek after novelties of their own invention (towards which weak human nature is already sufficiently prone), instead of guiding them, as Lord John Russell formerly suggested, towards the strengthening and improving that system of education which had grown up chiefly from voluntary efforts?

Nothing is more trite or common than the remark that, however defective any law or rule may be in theory, yet if it be carried out in practice by good and able hands it works well, whilst a law or rule perfect in theory, if the application of it be confided to unfit or inexperienced hands, may in its results be very far from harmonizing with its design.

Granting, then, if it be possible, for a moment, that a good scheme of education, for children of every variety of religious belief, has been planned and sanctioned, are either a town council or a parish vestry fitted to have "the entire management, direction, and superintendence of such schools," and may not a system originally well designed be tortuously managed, so as to produce great practical mischiefs? What is the check? Inspection by government inspectors. But the Bill gives them no power to apply a prompt remedy, even if they discover occasion for it; they would, we presume, have power only to *recommend* to the School Managers, and to *report* to the Educational Committee of the Privy Council. All persons engaged in the practical administration of any affairs of business, or even of only ordinary experience and observation, know how long evils may continue to exist in the actual conduct of any public department before it be possible to detect and expose a sufficient number of particular instances, how difficult such an exposure is, and how long after the exposure has been accomplished, it will yet be before a complete remedy arrive from head quarters, if ever a complete remedy arrive at all. And what is the remedy, the only one which the Educational Committee of the Privy Council have power to apply? Annihilation—that only. Neither the Inspectors nor the Privy Council have power to stop any particular mischief, to introduce any particular improvement, the latter have only power to put a stop to the schools altogether, they "may at any time make an order, recalling any order, approving any scheme under this act, stating the reasons for such recal; and after such order of recal the provisions of this act respecting the council or vestry, and the schools established or aided by them shall cease and determine," so that, although the privy council should see certain defects in any schools, or think them susceptible of certain improvements, yet they have no power to amend them, and cannot even consistently exercise the only power conferred upon them, if they deem the existing schools, however defective, to be better than none at all. And all this awkward local machinery and ineffective central control, to set up something new in lieu of a system which Lord John Russell praises, as we have seen, for the results it has already accomplished!

His Lordship in 1853, stated that, "neither he nor the

present government could be a party to any plan for proposing a secular mode of teaching instead of that which was at present established." Yet the present Bill enables a town council or a parish vestry to propose "a secular mode of teaching," the only religious requirement in the act being, "that the Holy Scriptures shall be read in the school as part of the reading therein, but not so as to be used as a school lesson-book."

"He did not think it possible to unite throughout the country the children of persons of different religious communions in one plan of education." Yet, this Bill, endorsed by his Lordship, now authorizes the establishment of such a plan, and it expressly contemplates the collection of children of different religions in one school, since it provides that "no child of any parents professing the Roman Catholic or the Jewish religion, shall be obliged to be present at the reading of the Holy Scriptures, unless such parents, or the guardians of such child, are willing that such child should be so present." Is it possible that the same person who uttered the sentiments we have quoted from him only two years ago, could now, with full knowledge of its contents, have introduced the present Bill? The presumption is almost irresistible that his Lordship is not really aware of its purport. In certain respects the present plan agrees with that propounded by him on the former occasion, in employing the agency of town councils to express public opinion in boroughs, as to the expediency of an education rate, in requiring a majority of two-thirds of the council, and in some other details sufficient to show that the one is borrowed from or grafted upon the other, but the variances are not merely variances, but contradictions, and contradictions in essential matters. What, for example, can be more essentially important than the kind of schools which in corporate towns are to be supported by an education rate; yet the present Bill authorizes the establishment of schools quite different from those which alone were thought deserving of aid on the former occasion. Lord John Russell *then* said:

"In towns of this kind, (which had a corporate organization,) there was not any necessity for establishing schools of one kind. There were in those towns, generally, schools belonging to various communions, all of which received, or might receive, some support

by the ministers of the Committee of the Privy Council. It appeared to them, therefore, that it was possible, at all events, to give power to the commissioners and municipal councils of such towns, and vote a rate for the purpose of improving education therein. But in so doing they should think it necessary to *impose certain conditions, in order to prevent evil which might otherwise arise.* They thought it necessary that the rate should be applied, *not to establish schools in substitution of former schools, but in aid of the voluntary efforts of individuals,* and of the school pence given by the parents of the children."

A very excellent arrangement, and one which appears so sound and prudent that it is almost impossible to suppose his Lordship could be aware that the present Bill admits of the very evil which he was then desirous of guarding against, and that it authorizes a Town Council to submit a scheme for the promotion of Education in their borough, by establishing and maintaining a new school or schools, which may, of course, either by original design be, or by subsequent management in practice, become substituted for those former schools there supported by the voluntary efforts of individuals.

Again, upon a vitally important principle, that of religious instruction, Lord John Russell, two years ago, said:

"The resolution to which the association (i.e. the Manchester and Salford School Association,) had come, made it an absolute and essential condition that the Scriptures should be read in the authorized version, leaving, however, the Roman Catholics to use the Douay version. But it was to be expected, and it did occur, that the Roman Catholics demurred altogether to the religious instruction to be given in such schools, and they, therefore, formed a minority dissenting from that plan. Now, he (Lord John Russell) *thought the same difficulty would be found in any attempts to frame any other plan, and they should not, therefore, propose that the power of the town councils should go further than the appointment of a committee, which should distribute the sums obtained from the rate according to the ministers of the Committee of Privy Council.*"

His Lordship *then* thought the objections of the Roman Catholics to the religious teaching under the Manchester and Salford system so far reasonable that he framed his own plan to avoid them, whilst now he makes his own plan *still more objectionable* than the Manchester and Salford system. He, or at least his Bill, (for we will not

impute it to him personally) now makes it, as the Manchester and Salford system then did, an absolute and essential condition, that the Scriptures should be read *in the authorized version*, in every school aided under the Bill, (except distinct Catholic or Jewish schools, if any such could be likely to come into existence under the Bill,) but it does *not* leave the Catholics at liberty to use the Douay version, it merely permits them on such occasions to walk out of the schools, a kind of procedure not very likely to promote their comfortable association with their fellows. Why are Catholics to be subjected to this indignity because they cannot consider the authorized but inaccurate version of Holy Scriptures to be really the Word of God? Are Protestants treated in a corresponding manner in Ireland? Is the Douay or Catholic version there directed to be used in all the joint schools, with permission to the Protestant children to be absent? Yet Protestants are the minority in Ireland, as Catholics are the minority in England. All we claim is, that *the same measure of justice be meted out to the Catholic minority in England, which is accorded to the Protestant minority in Ireland.*

But the difficulties to which we have just alluded, as involved in the provisions of the present Bill, were avoided in the plan more carefully propounded by His Lordship in 1853. He did not then propose to authorize town councils, to establish and manage new schools in which all the varieties of religion should be aggregated together, the considerations which we have already quoted in His Lordship's words, led him rather to propose that the power of the town councils should go no further than the appointment of a committee which should distribute the sums obtained from the rate according to the minutes of the Committee of the Privy Council. The Education Rate would, according to this more prudent scheme, have been applied in aid of the existing schools established and maintained mainly by the voluntary efforts of the more sincere and zealous members of each religious body, and placed under government inspection, where, therefore, the peculiar founders of each school cared most appropriately and effectually as to its course of religious instruction, whilst the State, by inspection, promoted and became assured respecting the general secular education. This was a fair and impartial system, from which the present

Bill has unfortunately, and, we still trust, unknown to its nominal introducer, departed.

The town council, moreover, was to have no control over the schools, and no concern in the actual management of them, a provision which any one practically acquainted with the composition of town councils, would deem one of ordinary prudence; the present Bill vests in the town council, "the entire management, direction, and superintendence of the schools to be established *or aided* by them," so that not only would the new schools, to be originally established by town councils, be under their management, but if the town council were, in their wisdom, minded to extend aid out of the Education rate to any existing schools, no such existing schools, whether Church of England, Wesleyan, Dissenting, Catholic, or of any other kind, could receive one farthing of such aid from the education rate without thereby divesting their own founders, trustees, and managers, of all right of further control over them, and at once vesting their entire management, direction, and superintendence in the town council. Surely Lord John Russell could not have had any such intention; surely no sane man could have drawn such a Bill!

But though the duties of the town council were confined to the apportionment of the Educational Rate amongst the existing schools under government inspection, yet careful provision was made, as Lord John Russell in his former speech tells us, that "the committee to be appointed by the town council" (for even that limited object) "would be formed partly of members of the council, and partly of other persons resident in the town, who would be able to obtain accurate information with respect to the schools, and see that all the conditions required by the State, were complied with in those schools." Yet now the members of the town council alone, without any aid from other persons resident in the town (and possibly more conversant with schools) are to administer the still larger, nay, the arbitrary and exclusive powers to be so lavishly confided to them by this Bill. The framers of this Bill must have lost all forethought and discretion, and have been indeed under the influence of some peculiar hallucination.

But though we cannot speak in terms of commendation of the present Bill, we must admit that the proposal of Lord John Russell in 1853, seemed to meet the peculiar

difficulties of the education question in this country in a very reasonable manner. That suggestion in effect was, as will have appeared from our previous quotations, that neither the state nor town councils should originate any new system of education, and that, far from interfering with the voluntary educational efforts at present making by different religious bodies, it should only guide and improve their secular branch of instruction by inspection, and assist them by pecuniary allowance, *according to the actual number of children attending each such school*. A government inspector devoted to the business of examining and reporting upon the state and condition of a great number of schools of every possible character, and frequently visiting them, might have a wholesome effect in quickening the energies of schoolmasters, keeping them up to the highest point of exertion, and enabling them to profit by the experience and suggestions which the inspector had collected throughout his whole tour of investigation. An inspector, in fact, might be a material aid to any school committee in ascertaining that the schoolmaster did his duty, whilst *they* would probably be vigilant enough to take care that the inspector did not exceed his duty.

We cordially agree with Lord John Russell that the state should not support any mere secular system of education, even on the recommendation of a town council. It cannot originate in this country a uniform religious system of its own, and the only remaining mode, therefore, is that which Lord John Russell recommended two years ago, and which, although deviated from by the present Bill, we trust he will on consideration again adopt, of assisting voluntary religious efforts in the cause of education, provided only they give the guarantee of character and efficiency in secular instruction, by submitting the latter to government inspection.

Of the plan of the Public School Association, of that recommended by Mr. W. J. Fox, M.P., and of any other plan of merely secular education, excluding religious instruction, we would only say that their principles may be very sound and suitable for training a horse, a dog, or any other animal, the existence of which terminates with its life, but they are not appropriate to a human being who is placed here for the sole object of determining by his own conduct in this world what shall be his position in another.

The advocates of a national system of secular education do not however usually deny the value of religious instruction, they only say that it cannot, in any general system, be incorporated with secular teaching, without unfairness to some body or other, and therefore they would exclude it from a national system of education, and leave vacant opportunities for its being separately supplied either by parents, who too often want it themselves, by clergy who have often other heavy duties disabling them from attending to this, or by any one who may volunteer to fill up parenthetically this really essential part of a child's education. This is not the mode in which these advocates of secular education deal with their own sons and daughters. Whatever may be the religious persuasion to which they belong, they are usually careful to send their own children to a school where they will be instructed in the religious truths which they themselves conscientiously maintain. All we ask these gentlemen is, that any education for the poor to be provided or aided from the public purse, should as closely as possible resemble that which, as a general rule, they set all parents the example of choosing for their own children.

But how can this be compatible with the freedom of the very numerous varieties of religious belief which prevail in this country? The Education Committee of the Privy Council have already aimed at accomplishing this by aiding to some extent the zealous efforts of those who undertake the duty of establishing free schools for the education of the poor. If it be expedient still further to assist these efforts by local education rates, then Lord John Russell's scheme, as proposed by him two years ago, is one which we should rather attempt to improve than to oppose. He said :—

“ They should propose some such scheme as this—that the rate might be applied to pay two-pence in the week for the scholars, provided four pence or five pence were contributed from other sources. The schools which received this assistance, should be schools which, under the minutes of the privy council, might receive assistance, and which, consequently, had for years received the sanction of parliament.”

The introduction of this rate in every borough he made dependent upon the vote of a majority, consisting of not less than two-thirds of the town council. And he men-

tioned that the Education Committee of the Privy Council, had proposed also by a minute, which had been for some time under consideration, to allow in certain instances to places which had not municipal corporations, a certain sum per head for each child attending the school.

“The Committee of the Privy Council had likewise resolved upon the propriety of making additional grants for buildings in some poor places where great difficulty existed in obtaining a sum for establishing schools.”

We were glad to observe this last resolution, because, if so much consideration be due to *poor places*, it must be equally due to *poor persons* wherever resident, if they be so circumstanced as to be unable to get schools erected for them, if e.g. they be poor persons of one faith surrounded by persons of another faith, or of no faith at all. The defect, indeed, of the present system of distributing the parliamentary education grant is, that it proceeds upon the principle of allowing much to have more. Grants are made only in a certain proportion to local subscriptions, and, following out the same idea, His Lordship proposed to confine the aid from the education rate to two pence a week from each scholar, “provided four pence or five pence be contributed from other sources.” The consequence is, that under the distribution by the Education Committee of the Privy Council, as it still would be under Lord John Russell's proposal, the rich bodies least in need of aid obtain the largest share of pecuniary aid, whilst those who are poor and have probably plenty of poor children needing instruction which they cannot give them, are denied their numerical proportion of national aid just because they are in extreme want of it. The privy council have, Lord John Russell informs us, seen the propriety of deviating from such a rule under certain circumstances, and we trust they will give still further attention to the urgent claims of poverty and numbers.

We trust also for the same reason that, if an education rate be sanctioned at all, it will be justly distributed, according rather to the wants and necessities of the poor, than as a sequence to the private liberality of the rich, and that the unfortunate circumstance of any number of poor children being unfriended or without adequate private aid

•

shall not be a reason for also withholding from them the public assistance.

To any interference in the management of schools, either by a central government, or by any local body, we strongly object; they will most effectually and usefully accomplish their purpose without any such interference. A periodical visitation by a government inspector, whose experience and practical observation of a variety of schools makes him well aware what is best and most appropriate for each, and enables him to point out errors and suggest improvements, may be a valuable auxiliary to most establishments for the education of the poor, and the moral effect of his recommendations to the teachers and managers of each school, and of his published reports to government, might not only tend to keep any school from getting far wrong, but enable each to borrow what was best from the others, and keep them all in a steady course of improvement.

Why should not every school so inspected, (being also a free school,) have a legal claim to the extent of, say five-pence, for every boy, and four-pence for every girl, *actually attending* such school? The local body, through the medium of which the Education Rate would be collected, should, we conceive, have no other interference with the affairs of any school than to ascertain, 1st., That the school is under government inspection and a free school; 2nd. What are the number of boys and girls actually attending such school each week? and, 3rd. To pay out of the rate to the managers of each school the fixed amount due to them, according to the above scale of payment.

Provisions would, of course, be requisite to secure a proper record of the weekly attendance of scholars at each school, and the Education Rate might be limited in each year to a certain sum per pound of rateable value, which might, of course, involve a proportionate reduction of the weekly pay for each scholar, if the limited rate did not supply funds for the full scale of allowance.

The error, alike of the Manchester and Salford scheme, and of Lord John Russell's *present* Bill, appears to us to be this, in supposing it requisite that the local body, by whom the Education Rate is collected, should, under any circumstances, have anything to do with the practical management of education. We prefer the contrary opinion

expressed by Lord John Russell two years ago, and conceive that the rate-collecting body ought to stand in much the same position, with respect to the education of the poor, as the overseers now do, with respect to the relief of the poor; the overseers forming merely the machinery by which all are compelled to discharge, to a certain extent, the duty of relieving the poor, but the funds thus collected by them being handed over to, and the relief actually administered by the guardians. In a corresponding position to that of the overseers, ought, in our opinion, to be placed the local organization for collecting the Education Rate. They would form, in fact, a national machinery to prevent any one escaping from the duty of contributing his quota towards the education of the poor. But the funds thus levied by them they would distribute to those who are now acting as the zealous and conscientious guardians of education throughout the country, according to the very best test of need in each instance, the actual number of scholars. The only practical effect of an Education Rate would thus be to extract something for the purposes of education from the pockets of those *who would not voluntarily have contributed to it*; and all classes and denominations would thus secure the pecuniary means of education according to the actual numbers requiring it. The freedom of education would remain complete, while the free efforts of the willing spirits at present devoted to so good a cause, would receive pecuniary aid according to the actual success of their exertions, with the advantage of collateral aid and advice from the government inspector. Each one would be left at liberty, as now, to avail himself of that form of education which he preferred, the only difference would be, that the burden of the pecuniary cost of educating the poor would not rest, as now, exclusively on the shoulders of the willing few, but would be rateably borne by all according to their rateable means.

With regard to parishes and other places beyond municipal boundaries, we infer that, if it were not fitting to entrust the management of education in boroughs to town councils, neither could it be suited to entrust that delicate duty to parish vestries in parishes; indeed, any arrangement of the kind would be entirely needless, if such a legal allowance as we have mentioned, were directed to be made for the scholars actually attending all inspected free schools; voluntary zeal might then

safely be left to establish and manage them wherever wanted; and worse than needless, because it would involve all the difficulties and mischiefs inherent in a composite board of management. Independent of all other objections, no state machinery, or parochial machinery, could ever manage any schools as well as the voluntary efforts of men conscientiously devoted to the cause of religious education. With these voluntary efforts government should not encourage any local authorities officiously to intermeddle, but rather aid and support them in the manner suggested. The state or the parish would be a very indifferent schoolmaster, though well enough adapted to be an effective Tax Collector.

Since the foregoing remarks were penned, we have perused the debate on Sir John Pakington's motion for leave to bring in a Bill for the better encouragement of Education in England and Wales, and its tendency is very strongly to confirm all our previous impressions.

Sir John Pakington proposes, if we understand him rightly, not merely to leave existing schools undisturbed, but to aid them out of the Education Rate, subject to the condition of their being under government inspection; and the only variance as to these schools, between the present plan of Sir John Pakington and that of Lord John Russell, *two years ago*, would seem to be, that whilst the Tory baronet would make the schools perfectly *free*, and support them wholly from the public rate, the Whig lord would give a small part of what was requisite for their support out of the public purse, provided the remainder were forthcoming from private and other sources. Our readers will have gathered from our previous remarks that, as between the two, we should incline to think Sir John Pakington's the preferable proposal.

But the rock upon which they both split, and upon which the Manchester and Salford system also splits, is, in seeking to authorize any local public body whatever to intermeddle in the *management* of schools, and, when they think there are not schools enough in a locality, to erect and conduct new schools according to some plan of their own. This would be both a needless and a mischievous interference. Surrounded with difficulties and liable to mischief all admit that such an interference would be: the onus therefore of proving its need lies with

those who propose it. Sir John Pakington seems to imagine that, if he only prove that the existing schools do not adequately educate all the poor children of the country, it therefore follows, as a necessary consequence, that new schools should be established and managed *by some public body or other*. Yet is this a necessary consequence at all? There is a *tertium quid* far better calculated to accomplish the object of education and to avoid all its acknowledged difficulties. *Give ample aid to the zealous committees of existing schools*, so as to enable these friends and managers of education to respond alike to the public wants and to their own wishes. Is it not obvious that the men who are now, to the utmost of their limited means, caring for and fostering education, will do this work better than any public board? And can it be doubted that, if adequate pay out of an Education Rate be made the right of every child attending a school under government inspection, such schools will, through the spontaneous zeal of these men, rise up wherever they are wanted, especially if, in very poor districts, some little special contribution be accorded by the Education Committee of the Privy Council towards the erection of schools? If at Manchester, Sheffield, Newcastle on Tyne, and the other places mentioned by Sir John Pakington, the earnest members of each religious community knew that they could demand four-pence or five-pence a week for every scholar actually attending a school established by them under government inspection, would they not soon provide school-rooms and teachers for all the poor children of their respective bodies? Are not schools thus originating and thus managed, if only thus supported, far better than any composite schools under the composite management of any local board? and are they not free from all the difficulties and religious divisions which would embarrass the others? What need, then, of a new and hazardous experiment to do that which can be more safely and more effectually done by the expansion of a system of which we have had experience and recognize the merits, which in spite of scant means has already done much, and which, with larger means, may do more, indeed, everything possible?

But Sir John Pakington says in effect, "you can no more carry on education by means of voluntary management than you can carry on war by means of voluntary

management ;” the objection sounds rather antithetically plausible, but it seems to us that the system we suggest of enlarging, strengthening, and extending existing schools, and giving full pecuniary aid to all who may apply themselves to the conduct of education under government inspection very much resembles our British mode of warfare, wherein the military pay is raised by government taxes, whilst the soldiers entitle themselves to receive it by voluntary enlistment.

It is obvious also that Sir John Pakington's experiment of *free* schools can be just as well tried under an extension of the existing schools as by means of any new schools or any new organization.

There is one sophistical illustration in Sir John Pakington's speech which it may be well to expose. He says, that because the Poor Law Guardians give relief to the poor of all religions, equally can a local board impart education to all. The very statement of the sophism is its exposure. Every employer of labour might with equal truth say that he can as easily direct the education of all the children of his workmen as pay the latter their wages.

Religion has nothing to do with ordinary parochial relief, but Sir John Pakington expressly says in one part of his speech :

“ If there are honourable gentlemen in this house who contend that religion has nothing to do with education, and that we should teach no religion to children, I can only say that with them I have nothing in common.”

And in another part—

“ I am a Churchman myself, and will not forego the catechism.”

We honour him for the sentiment ; let him only concede to others what he claims for himself. He would deal with the religious difficulty by letting the majority in each place decide what shall be the general rule as to religious instruction, with leave of absence to the exceptional irregulars. *If Sir John Pakington will tell us why this system was not adopted in Ireland, we will tell him why we think it ought not to be adopted in England.* As it was not thought fair or favourable enough for the minority in Ireland, let the English minority have the benefit of the same consideration.

We beg, finally, to say that *we* have not proposed an education rate, but *if* it be adopted, we are sure, and we think careful reflection will lead most others to the conclusion, that, in the circumstances of this country, local public bodies cannot properly be entrusted with the *management* of Education; that their only appropriate duty would be to *collect* the rate, and pay over to the managers of each School under Government inspection, the sum due in respect of the actual number of scholars in weekly attendance at such school, and that, if private zeal were thus aided by public money, schools would soon spontaneously arise under the most effective management to meet the educational wants of the people. In these schools government and the public would deal with the religious difficulty in by far the most appropriate manner, viz., by *letting it alone*, and leaving each religious body to deal with it and with education together as they ought to be dealt with together, according to their own earnest convictions.

-
- ART. IX.—1. *The History of the Early Puritans*; from the Reformation to the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1853.
2. *The History of Later Puritans*; from the Opening of the Civil War, in 1642, to the Ejection of the non-conforming Clergy in 1662. By J. B. MARSDEN, M.A. Second Edition. London: Hamilton, Adams and Co. 1854.
3. *Origin and Development of Anglicanism*; or a History of the Litanies, Homilies, Articles, Bibles, Principles, and Governmental System of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. WATERWORTH, S.J. London: Burns and Lambert. 1854.
4. *A History of the Articles of Religion*. By CHARLES HARDWICKE, M.A. 8vo. Cambridge: Deighton. 1851.

5. *A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices.* By the REV. FRANCIS PROCTER, M.A., 8vo. Cambridge : Mc.Millan and Co. 1855.

WE are beginning to outgrow the memory of the once celebrated illustration by which Dr. Hook made it plain that the Anglican Church, before the Reformation, remains precisely identical with the Anglican Church of the present day, "as a man who has washed his face in the morning remains the same man as he was before he had washed." * For a long series of years, in the popular Anglican theory of the modern history of the National Church, the attitude which she has maintained from the sixteenth century downwards, was explained as purely or principally a self-reformation. It was held to have been purely her own act. She herself took the initiative. She herself laid down the great principles by which the reforms were to be guided ; she herself followed up the leading details in the work. If a Catholic historian or controversialist ventured to suggest that the moving power was the State and not the Church, he was met by an indignant denial. The State, it was admitted, had assisted in the carrying out of the plan. But it was the Church herself who conceived and matured it. She but accepted the assistance and support which were offered in her struggle. The State was but the "nursing mother" of the second infancy through which the Church had to pass in her progress towards a new and more perfect organisation.

Still, even while Dr. Hook's very primitive illustration was still in all the freshness of its novelty, there were found persons hard headed enough to question its appropriateness ; and some of our readers may yet recollect, in an early number of this Journal, † a very brilliant and masterly dissertation, one of the last great efforts of the illustrious Catholic historian of England, by which the silliness and absurdity of the pretension was unsparingly laid bare. It is an old theory of ours, that there are very few of the positions assumed by the antagonists of the Catholic

* A Sermon, preached at the Chapel Royal, in St. James's Palace, on the first Sunday after Trinity, June 17, 1838. By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., p. 7.

† Vol. viii. pp. 334 and following.

Church, which may not be turned against each other, with far more effect than they carry against the common adversary whom they all seek to assail. A skilful use of the weapons employed against each other by various sects of Protestantism, in their internecine warfare, would supply one of the most curious, and we will venture to say, one of the most solid and convincing, arguments of the truth of the Catholic Religion to be found in the whole range of polemical literature. And it is a very remarkable confirmation of the line of argument adopted by Dr. Lingard in the memorable article to which we refer, that the main theory by which Mr. Marsden, in his history of the Puritans, accounts for the character impressed upon the English Reformation, and for the contrasts which its system presents to that of the Reformation as developed in any of the churches of the Continent, is, that in the latter the movement was a spontaneous one, in the former it was but the result of an impulse from the power above. "The Reformation in England," says he "*originated with the monarch and was transmitted to the people through the regular forms of the constitution.* Upon the continent and in Scotland the order was reversed. With the exception of a few of the minor German states, in which the reigning princes led the movement they were unable to control, the reformation was *begun by the people*, and carried into effect *against the will of the higher civil authorities*, or without their assistance. The character of this vast revolution, both at home and abroad, *partook of the circumstances of its origin*, and in each case still retains the visible impression of its peculiar parentage. In England, the reformed religion immediately assumed the outward symbols of a monarchical institution and the church, represented by its higher clergy, again, as before the Reformation, took its place in the constitution, without exciting jealousy in the crown, or stimulating those passions which the possession of a new and formidable power invariably creates amongst the people. The spirit of the institution was naturally tinged by the same circumstances. It was a matter of course, in a reformation of which a succession of sovereigns were the first promoters, that episcopacy should be retained, and not less so that a certain degree of magnificence and splendour should invest the national church, and display itself both in the dignities of its hierarchy and in the ceremonial of its public worship: and

thus the church of England assumed, and has ever since retained, a more exact gradation of spiritual dignities, and a more stately mode of worship, than the reformed churches of other lands. Upon the continent the higher clergy, following the general example of the civil powers, stood aloof, or met the reformation with fierce hostility. Scarcely a churchman of rank joined with it. Princes and prelates viewed it at first with equal scorn, and afterwards, as they learned something of the vast and awful power it wielded, with equal hatred. Thus, the reformation in Germany, France and Switzerland was a popular, and sometimes a plebeian, movement. To a certain extent the case was similar in Scotland; except that the barons and chief estates of the kingdom being already arrayed against the sovereign, the management of the reformation fell into their hands: and the struggle between the new and the old opinions became political, and was embittered with another element of civil strife. Thus the reformation in the foreign churches, originating among the common people and the inferior clergy, took a democratic form. They became presbyterian in their government, and simple even to excess in their modes of worship. For the one they pleaded necessity; for the other the sanction of primitive antiquity, and the tenor of the new testament. None of them at first rejected episcopacy as unlawful. Calvin and others have recorded their concurrent sense of its importance; though in effect they considered themselves at liberty, under the circumstances in which they were placed, to reconstruct the reformed churches upon another model. For the simplicity of their forms of worship they made no apology; differing in this, though without personal animosities or any feeling of unkindness, from the great reformers of the church of England."

Nor has any of the Tractarian writers, notwithstanding the learning and zeal which they have devoted to the enquiry, succeeded even yet in disturbing the received theory of the last generation, that whatever of life or energy there was in the religious revolution of England, was the same in spirit, in principle, in origin, and in tendency, with the kindred movement abroad, and especially in that foreign Church with which alone anything like active intercourse or cordial sympathy can be discovered—the Church of Geneva. During the reign of Henry, no one will pretend that the Church in England had a voice,

or even a living existence. Under Edward, the churchmen who acted, acted but as the exponents of the higher powers who were all partizans of the foreign Reformation; and in the final organization of the Church system under Elizabeth, the only part taken therein by the Church itself, was to act as a drag upon the onward progress of innovation. High Church theories may interest us by their earnest scholarship, or please our fancy by their poetical associations; but no one can read, without prepossession, the history of any single passage in the whole career of the English Reformation, and, so reading, resist the earnest, though reluctant conviction, that had the movement been left free, had it directed itself according to its own impulses, the result would have been, (perhaps after many pauses and oscillations, but yet inevitably,) some modification or another of that spiritual system, which, in the various forms in which it has manifested itself at different times and in different circumstances, is known under the general name of PURITANISM.

The very origin, indeed, of the party in England, would in itself, lead us to that conclusion. On the check which the reforming movement, begun with so much vigour under Edward, received at the accession of Mary, the most ardent of the reformers of the previous reign and those who were most deeply compromised, sought safety either in concealment at home or in a retirement into the more congenial shelter of the foreign Churches of opinions kindred with their own. Their return to England on the accession of Elizabeth, found them not alone with their natural ardour unsubdued by adversity, but, even on this very account, with all their former views exaggerated by a large infusion of the more sweeping and revolutionary spirit which distinguished the democratic communions of Switzerland, which had been the chief scene of their exile. Now, these are the men to whom the Puritan element of the English Reformation is due. These are the Puritan Fathers. And the very violence and exaggeration of their views engendered an earnestness which has left its trace upon all that they did or attempted, and which contrasts very markedly with the timid, vacillating, "open question" system, which forms the great characteristic of the theology of the state party in the Church under Elizabeth.

We have been much disappointed in our hope of finding Mr. Marsden's "*History of the Puritans*," a solution of

these and many other interesting questions connected with the church affairs of that period ; nor can we say that it will add much to our knowledge of this remarkable party. In the effort to be popular, the author has become vague, sketchy, and superficial. Of the theology of the Puritans his work cannot be said to contain any history at all ; and even their political fortunes, as a party, are not traced with that distinctness and precision which should constitute the chief merit of a book specially devoted to themselves. Above all, in what would form the most attractive and curious department of their history—the Biography of the Puritans—Mr. Marsden is singularly deficient. His sketches of the great heroes of the party are extremely few and meagre, and they are entirely destitute of that graphic force and dramatic interest, which, in what are called popular histories, form the best compensation for the want of depth and comprehensiveness of detail, by which unfortunately they are so commonly accompanied.

Like all who have gone before him as historians of puritanism, he professes his inability to offer any satisfactory account of the origin of the name itself. It occurs very soon after the accession of Elizabeth, but it does not appear to have been much used for ten years afterwards. Mr. Marsden urges it as a testimony to the moral character of those by whom it was first borne ; and argues that “it seems to imply that if their professions were high, their lives, at least, were consistent, and their morals *pure*.” But the argument is entirely without foundation. It is plain that the name was not one of their own choosing. He admits that it was applied to them in scorn, that it was borne with impatience, and often resented as a grievous wrong ; nor can it be doubted that both in its import, and with motives of its application, it is a literal transcript of the old appellative *Cathari*, a title borne, if not assumed, by every sect of rigoristic pretensions, from the Montanists to the Insabbatati and the Waldensians.

It is well worthy of observation that, in common with all their other historians, Mr. Marsden represents the Puritans throughout the first phase of their history, as undoubted members of the Church of England, and declares, that “though anxious for improvement, and sometimes fretful for change, they revered the great principle of an established church, and did not entertain a thought of separating from her communion.” And to those

who in later times, and especially during the great movement of the last twenty years, have so strongly insisted upon the separation of the two elements in the church, and have so earnestly clung to the fond belief that their own (or what they call the Catholic) system, was the primitive system of the reformed English Church of the sixteenth century, it should furnish grave matter for reflection, that, even under the iron rule of Elizabeth, at the very time when the constitution of their Church was being finally determined, and when, after full discussion of all the controversies, both domestic and foreign, which had arisen, the code of Articles of Religion was definitively settled, it was fully understood, both on the side of the Puritans, and on that of the men who sought to maintain a higher tone, that free provision was made, and full room was given, for the comprising, within its ample terms, *both the extremes towards which they severally tended*. In truth, neither the decision of the privy council in the Gorham case, nor the evident shrinking from a decision in the cases of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Archdeacon Denison, can be regarded as a plainer evidence of that "compromise," which is the very essence of Anglicanism, than the position accorded to the Puritans, and occupied by them, during the forty years of the reign of Elizabeth.

We cannot help being struck in Mr. Marsden's history, by the absence of all notice of the earlier members of the party, and particularly of those among them who distinguished themselves by their writings during the reign of Mary. It was not unnatural, indeed, that Mr. Marsden should desire to close his eyes to those darker fruits of the Reformation in England, which Strype, writing in the year 1556, very feelingly describes. It is not wonderful that he should be willing to pass by "the abundance of sects, and dangerous doctrines, whose maintainers shrouded themselves under the professors of the Gospel;" some of whom "denied the Godhead of Christ, and some impugned His manhood;" some, again, denied the Godhead of the Holy Ghost, or original sin, or free will, or infant baptism, and who were so numerous and so widely-spread, that, by Strype's own account the divinity professor of Oxford, Traheron, thought it necessary, in order to meet the evil, to direct his lectures not against the Papists, who were comparatively unobnoxious, but "against the Arians, who began much to increase in their times." Sectaries like these

do not, it is true, fairly come within a plan such as Mr. Marsden's. But we cannot help wondering that he did not give us any account of Joye, or Delaber, or Goodman, or Ponet, or John Bale, or of that Traheron, the divinity professor, to whom we have just alluded. These are, beyond all question, the earliest founders and most rightful representatives of the Puritan system, and as such should not have been passed over in a work which professes to detail the history of the party. Possibly Mr. Marsden may not have been unwilling to escape this painful chapter on Puritan history. To have alluded to it at all would have entailed some revelations which it was perhaps more pleasant to avoid. No serious historian dealing professedly with that period, could have avoided going over once again the ground which was so fearlessly broken by Dr. Maitland, in his "Essays on the English Reformation;" and the pictures of "Puritan Veracity," "Puritan Loyalty," and "Puritan Charity," which Dr. Maitland's too candid pencil has drawn, would have formed but a sorry frontispiece for a history so thoroughly eulogistic as Mr. Marsden's was designed to be.

The first event in the history of Puritanism, on which Mr. Marsden dwells, is the celebrated Vestiarian Controversy; and he observes, as a very remarkable circumstance, that for many years after the first development of their principles, and their first organization as a party, this was the only controversy in which they engaged with the Established Church. We can hardly understand in what sense Mr. Marsden ventures upon this assertion. It is true, indeed, that Bishop Carleton, in his Examination of Montague's Appeal, contends that while the Puritans urged for the adoption of their own favourite discipline, "they never moved any quarrel against the doctrine of the Church." But this statement is entirely irreconcilable with many unquestioned facts. The Act of 1571, was so ambiguously worded as to exempt the puritanic clergy from subscribing the articles on ecclesiastical traditions; and, under cover of this non-subscription, they claimed most complete liberty of doctrine.* The two well-known Puritan manifestoes,—the "Admonitions to Parliament" in 1572, vehemently assail the Prayer-book

* See Hardwicke's *History of the Articles*, p. 201.

and the Ordinal, while they grant but a qualified and reluctant toleration to the Articles themselves. If they consent to receive the last-named formulary, it is only on the understanding, that they use "a godly interpretation in a poynte or two, which are either too sparely or else too darkly set downe;" while, with reference to the Prayer-book and Ordinal, they openly declare the one to be full of corruptions, and the other to contain a paragraph which is "manifest blasphemy." A few years later, we find an organized agitation against the article on the Holy Scripture; against the sixteenth article as implying the doctrine of defectibility from grace; and, indeed, against the whole body of the articles "as the fruit of prelatical or popish domination." Nor can it, we think, be reasonably doubted, that such opinions regarding the articles prevail to a greater or less degree among the religious malecontents throughout the entire reign of Elizabeth. *

It may be that Mr. Marsden, when he asserts that no doctrinal division had taken place between the Puritans and the Church, relies upon the fact that these and similar objections to the articles and similar demands for their modification or explanation existed among the churchmen themselves, and therefore may be regarded as at least tolerated within her pale. Understood in this sense, his statement is certainly true. In the well-known controversies which disturbed the universities, and especially that of Cambridge, during the last ten years of the sixteenth century, the warmest advocates of the Calvinistic doctrines were not merely by subscription of the articles members of the Anglican church, but were among the most zealous defenders of the Prayer-book and Ritual. The party at Cambridge, which compelled the retirement of the Arminian Margaret Professor, Baron, and the retraction of the University Preacher, William Barrett, would have repudiated the alliance with Puritanism almost as indignantly as the tractarians of our own day. Whitaker, the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, who was the leader of the movement, cordially accepted the Prayer-book, professed himself a devout adherent of Episcopacy, and was not only regarded as an unexceptionable churchman, but, from the learning and ability which he had

* Ibid. p. 202-4.

displayed in his controversy with Bellarmine, was universally looked up to as one of the great champions of Anglican orthodoxy. Equally unquestioned by the Anglicans of this period was the orthodoxy and churchmanship of his friend and colleague Perkins; yet Perkins's views upon election and reprobation, and other dogmas of Calvinism, would entitle him to a place in the most rigorous school of Puritan theology.

But in whatever sense we understand this memorable fact of the long peace between the Church and the early Puritans, it can only be regarded as another historical evidence of the compromise on which the very constitution of the Church was based, and to which alone she owed the semblance of union which she contrived to maintain under Elizabeth. Mr. Marsden distinctly maintains that during the forty years of peace, there was no recognized difference of doctrine between the Anglican church and those of continental Protestantism.

“It would not be difficult to show that all the foreign churches taught, with scarcely a perceptible shade of difference, the doctrines of our own. The presbyterian church of Scotland expresses herself in language entirely consonant with that of the English church, whether in our office for baptism, our articles, or our catechism; and in language of equal strength. ‘We assuredly believe that by baptism we are engrafted into Christ Jesus, to be made partakers of his justice, by which our sins are covered and remitted: and that also in the supper, rightly used, Christ Jesus is so joined with us that he becometh the very nourishment and food of our souls. But all this, we say, cometh of true faith, which apprehendeth Christ Jesus, who only maketh his sacraments effectual unto us.’ Thus she speaks in her confession, which was first exhibited to, and allowed by, the three estates in parliament, at Edinburgh, in the year 1560; again ratified at the same place, and on the same authority, in 1567; and finally subscribed by the king and his household, at Holyrood house, in 1581. Seventy years afterwards, when the presbyterian divines assembled at Westminster to remodel the church of England, and to carry out the most fervent aspirations of Cartwright in his younger days, the doctrine of the sacraments was still the same. Of baptism they say: ‘By the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited, and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such, whether of age or infants, as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God’s own will, in his appointed time.’ And of the eucharist to the same effect: ‘Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacra-

ment, do also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporeally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death ; the body and blood of Christ being then not corporeally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine, yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to the outward senses.

“ These may be received as the views of the puritans themselves; including that extreme section who would have overthrown episcopacy and established in England a presbyterian or an independent church. For the church of Scotland naturally felt, and indeed formally expressed, a sympathy with the English puritans : and the Westminster divines, when the puritans properly so called had died out, succeeded in their place. Lord Bacon may be taken as a fair and, all must admit, a competent representative of the church party. Though averse to Whitgift's severity, and, in common with the other courtiers and statesmen of the day, not well pleased to be over-shadowed by the splendours of the hierarchy, still he was no puritan ; he thought their scruples needless if not schismatical. He has left on record a confession of his faith which might, for the doctrines it contains, have been written indifferently by Cartwright or by Whitgift,—by an imprisoned puritan or by the head of the church of England. For its singular force and beauty, it well deserves a place in a religious history of those times. And it will confirm the position we have endeavoured to establish, that theological differences on points of doctrine had no share in the disputes which then rent the church of England.

“ The authority of the christian ministry,—the source from whence it is derived, and the channel along which it flows,—has now for a long time been agitated with incessant heat amongst the various classes of religionists in England. It was not, however, one of those points upon which the puritans entertained any peculiar sentiments ; or differed from their opponents of the other party. This root of bitterness had not yet sprung up : who were, and who were not, accredited ministers of Jesus Christ, was a point upon which a perfect agreement as yet existed between them. It was in the year 1589 that Bancroft, then chaplain to Whitgift, but afterwards bishop of London and archbishop of Canterbury, preached a sermon at St. Paul's cross which at once opened a new strife. He maintained in his sermon that bishops were, by the institution of God himself, an order in the christian ministry superior to priests and deacons, and distinct from them ; and that they governed the church and the inferior clergy, *jure divino*, by a right inherent to their office, and derived from God alone. The denial of these truths, he said, was heresy.”—pp. 224-228.

Vital as the doctrine of Episcopacy and Apostolical

succession has become in the theories of later Churchmen, Mr. Marsden holds that during this period of Anglicanism it was an open, or at least, an undecided question. Even the necessity of episcopal ordination itself, at that time, formed no essential dogma of Anglicanism. There are several remarkable examples of Presbyterian ministers not merely beneficed, but holding high posts in the Church. The case of Whittington, Dean of Durham, is one of those cited by Mr. Marsden. He had been ordained at Geneva according to the Presbyterian form of that Church; and nevertheless, soon after the accession of Elizabeth, he was, without any further ceremonial, presented to the deanery of Durham, which he held unquestioned for fourteen years. Mr. Marsden is of opinion, too, that the real cause of his being disturbed in possession was not the defect of his ordination, but the obnoxious doctrines which he held and preached. When he was cited by the Archbishop of York, Sandys, the Genevan ordination was but one of the charges. Having declined the Archbishop's jurisdiction, a commission was appointed to hear the case, the president of which was Hutton, the Dean of York. And it is a significant specimen of the ideas on apostolical succession which then prevailed among English Churchmen, that Hutton openly declared his preference of "Genevan," over "Romish" ordination. "The Dean," said he, "was ordained in better sort than the Archbishop himself."

The case was carried to a new commission, of which "the lord president was a member. When the question of the ordination had been argued, the lord president exclaimed, 'I cannot agree to deprive him for that cause alone: this,' he said, 'would be ill taken by all the godly, both at home and abroad; that we allow of popish massing priests in our ministry, and disallow of ministers made in a reformed church.' The commission was again adjourned, and here the business dropped; for the next year the dean of Durham died."

Still more remarkable is the case of Travers, who was Hooker's colleague at the Temple.

"Whittingham had been ordained by the church of Geneva, a national institution, the church of a foreign state with which England was on terms of amity. It is uncertain whether Travers had not received deacon's orders according to the church of England (for he had a divinity degree from Cambridge); but he was a member, from the first, of the presbyterian church at Wandsworth.

Going abroad, he was certainly ordained a presbyter at Antwerp, by the synod there in 1578. Yet we find him associated with Hooker, as preacher at the Temple, in 1592. During this long interval, then, of fourteen years, his presbyterian orders had been allowed. He was also private tutor in the family of the lord treasurer Cecil. When at length silenced by Whitgift, it was objected to him, first, that he was not a lawfully ordained minister of the church of England; secondly, that he had preached without a licence; thirdly, that he had violated discipline and decency, by his public refutation of what Hooker, his superior in the church, had advanced from the same pulpit upon the same day. Had the first ground been felt by his opponents to have been impregnable, the other charges would probably have been omitted, and Travers would have been dismissed, no doubt, in a summary way. But it would seem that the stress was laid chiefly on the two latter articles; and indeed Travers was prepared with an answer to the first, and with an answer which he did not fail to use.

“An act had passed in the thirteenth year of queen Elizabeth, under which he was securely sheltered. It recognises the validity of foreign orders; and conveys to us historical evidence that ministers ordained by presbyterian synods were at that time beneficed in the church of England. The anomaly which admits a Romish priest but excludes a presbyter of the Scottish church, did not then exist. It was sufficient that the conforming minister should declare his assent, and subscribe to the articles of the church of England. Travers, in his petition to the privy council, pleads the force of this statute, and declares that many Scottish ministers were then holding benefices in England beneath its sanction. Attempts have been made to shew, that as the church of England recognised none but episcopal orders, the act of the thirteenth of Elizabeth cannot possibly refer to presbyterian ministers. But how far this assumption is correct, the passage we have cited from Hooker, and the case of dean Whittingham, to go no further, will at once enable the reader to decide.

“And though silenced at the Temple, Travers was still thought fit for high service in the church. Doctor Loftus, archbishop of Dublin and chancellor of Ireland, invited him to Dublin, and conferred upon him the office of provost of queen Elizabeth's new and royal foundation. This Travers accepted, and as head of Trinity college the world is indebted to him for the education of the illustrious Ussher, archbishop of Armagh. Civil war, the bane of Ireland, at length drove the provost from his post; the times were against him; he grew old and poor. Ussher still revered his teacher, visited him in person, and offered him presents of money; which, it is said, were thankfully declined.”—pp. 233-5.

It does not appear, Mr. Marsden thinks, that in the first year of their existence as a party, the Puritans were

distinguished, at least to the extreme degree in which the peculiarity afterwards manifested itself, by any very marked rigorism of practice, or any notable preciseness and simplicity of manners. In this, however, we cannot agree. Even if there were no other evidence, the very name by which they were popularly designated, would sufficiently imply the existence of this peculiarity. The truth, however, is, that there needed in those times but scanty show of exterior sanctity in order to secure the reputation of affected purity of life. The Reformation had been followed in England by the same profaneness and laxity both of doctrines and of life, which we have often shown by the confession of its own leaders, to have been its ordinary accompaniment.* Mr. Marsden himself confesses, that towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, "the example of her court was decidedly irreligious, and the contagion rapidly spread among the common people. A preposterous extravagance in dress and equipage; a heathenish delight in jousts and tournaments, and public spectacles and plays; the prevalence of oaths (freely indulged in by the queen herself); and to crown the whole, the studied desecration of the Sabbath, mark too plainly the hollowness of that religious profession which even men of fashion were still constrained to make. All men of real piety lamented the decay of vital godliness. Hooker, in his preface, deploras it as feelingly as Travers could have done. But the cry once raised, a grave exterior and a virtuous life were regarded as the sure signs of a puritan, that is, of one disaffected to the state. Men who had never entered a conventicle, nor had one misgiving about the cross in baptism, were wickedly driven from the church they loved, by contemptuous treatment or slanderous imputations: to be seen twice at church on Sunday, and to spend the rest of the day in reading the scriptures, was enough to bring upon a whole family the disgrace of puritanism."

Their first decided conflict with this popular prejudice was in the sabbatarian controversy, the origin of which is well described by Mr. Marsden.

* See ante vol. vii. 290, and foll. also vol. xxv. 205, and following

“A great advantage was given to the puritans in a controversy which arose upon the observance of the Lord's-day. Greenham, a pious and eloquent minister in London, deeply affected by the prevailing levity, first recalled the nation to its duties, in 1592, in a book which made a great impression through the whole kingdom, and which Hall, the pious bishop of Norwich, afterwards embalmed in a striking epitaph. A few years afterwards, Dr. Bound published his ‘book on the Sabbath;’ in which, perhaps, he pushed the matter too far; and opposing one extreme fell into another; so as to rest the obligation of the Lord's-day upon Jewish, more than upon Christian, principles. Still he was right upon the whole; and, when the question was once fairly placed before them, the dullest congregation of the most stupid rustics could not but be struck with the monstrous and indecent inconsistency which every returning Sunday presented:—the fourth commandment was read in the forenoon with every circumstance calculated to inspire the deepest awe and reverence; the afternoon was devoted to fencing, and shooting, and bowling; to May games and morris dances; the clergyman himself too often a spectator, if not a sharer, of the sports. The parish church was frequently the scene of uproar. The painted harlequin rushed into it followed by a crowd of the dissolute and idle, and the instant the service closed one might hear the jingling of his bells, and see his company gathering around their leader in their ‘fools coats’ of many a colour. The evil was enormous; yet it was thought necessary to suppress Bound's treatise; and the natural consequence ensued; the book flew through successive editions, and its principles were diffused through England. The observance and the sacred obligation of the Lord's-day became immediately a question between the high church party and the puritans; and must be especially noticed as the first disagreement betwixt them upon any point of doctrine. This sabbatarian question, as it was called, henceforth entered largely into every controversy; a rigid or lax observance of the Lord's-day was at length the sign by which, above all others, the two parties were distinguished.”—Pp. 245-7.

There is little of novelty, and indeed very little of depth in Mr. Marsden's history of the doctrinal conflicts between Puritanism and the antagonistic element of Anglicanism. His account of the Quinquarticular controversy, of the Hampton Court conference, and still more of the disputes arising out of the Synod of Dort, is exceedingly meagre and unsatisfactory; and the reader will learn more of the real history of this contest from a single chapter of Mr. Hardwicke's *History of the Articles*,* than from the

* Chapter vii. p. 155, and foll. See also Chapter ix.

weak and diluted dissertations of the historian of the Puritans.

'There is one passage, however, which although not new, is worth transcribing for its own sake—the close of King James's Conference with the Puritan representatives at Hampton Court. It is thoroughly characteristic.

"Knewstubs was at length permitted to proceed. He craved permission to propose three queries. Had the church power to institute an external significant sign? Supposing the church had such power, was it lawful to add one sign where Christ had already ordained another? And, granting that these two questions could be answered in the affirmative, How far was such an ordinance of the church to bind dissatisfied consciences, without impeaching their christian liberty? To the first and second questions grave and reasonable answers were given by the prelates; to the last the king himself made answer. He told him that he would not argue that point with him, but answer him as kings are wont to speak in parliament, *le roy s'avisera*; adding withal that it smelled very rankly of anabaptism. A beardless boy in Scotland had told him, he said, not long ago, that he would submit to him in doctrine, but that matters of ceremony were to be left in christian liberty to every man, as they received more and more light from the illumination of the Spirit: 'Even till they go mad,' quoth the king, 'with their own light. But I will none of that: I will have one doctrine and one discipline; one religion in substance and in ceremony: and therefore I charge you never more to speak on that point, how far you are bound to obey when the church hath ordained it.' And so he asked them, continues the courtly historian of the Hampton court conference, if they had anything more to say!

"But his indignation burst all bounds when Dr. Reynolds dared to express the desire, always universal amongst the puritans, to have the prophecyings revised 'as the reverend archbishop Grindal and other bishops desired of her late majesty;' and that the clergy should be allowed to meet in provincial constitutions and in synods with the bishops. 'At which speech,' says Dr. Barlow, 'his majesty was somewhat stirred, yet, which was admirable in him, without passion or show thereof, thinking that they aimed at a Scottish presbytery, which, says he, agreeth as well with a monarchy, as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me, and my council, and all our proceedings: then Will shall stand up and say, it must be thus; then Dick shall reply and say, nay marry, but we will have it thus: and here I must once reiterate my former speech, *le roy s'avisera*,' &c.

"The indecency of this disgraceful scene was not yet at its height; the king concluded thus. Well, doctor, have you anything else to say?"

"*Dr. Reynolds.* No more, if it please your majesty.

"*The king.* If this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse."—Pp. 270-2.

Mr. Marsden is, of course, indignant at the unkingly and unchristian menaces with which James broke up the conference. But he does not attempt to conceal the fact that the Puritans themselves, the celebrated Pilgrim Fathers, their independence once consolidated, exhibited the same intolerance of which they were the victims in England, and of which indeed their transatlantic colony was a living monument. It would carry us beyond the limit of our allotted space to enter into the particulars of this history, which indeed is already sufficiently familiar to most of our readers. But we shall allow Mr. Marsden himself to be the historian of the intolerance of the Pilgrim Fathers towards a sect who had at least this claim on their sympathy, that they had been victims of the same persecution which had driven themselves into a foreign exile. This extract is a very long one; but its interest as well as its importance will be a sufficient explanation. Mr. Marsden, after relating several instances of minor intolerance, and describing in detail the circumstances in which the profession of Quakerism was made a capital felony in the colony, dwells at more length on the case of Mary Dyer.

"Mary Dyer, a quaker, was expelled from Massachusetts. She found an asylum in Roger Williams' new colony of Rhode Island, where all sects were tolerated alike. But she believed that she was urged by the Spirit who cannot err to return to Boston. She 'felt a call.' Only the flippant and profane will scoff at the doctrine, or scorn the words in which it was expressed. It might, for aught we know, be well worthy of God himself, to employ this quaker exile to repeat a long-forgotten message of christian love at Boston, which was to rebuke the sour austerity of their religious pride, and to be re-echoed in after ages, to all the ends of the earth, teaching everywhere, as it passed along, the dignity of suffering for conscience and for God, and the infamy of the oppressor. Substantially, Mary Dyer was, with all her errors, a martyr for the gospel's sake; and her persecutors were; in that act at least, the enemies of God.

"Two friends accompanied her, William Robinson and Marma-

duke Stevenson. They had not been many days in Boston before they were seized, imprisoned, arraigned before the governor and magistrates, and in short, sentenced to the gallows. 'Give ear, ye magistrates,' exclaimed Stevenson, as the sentence was pronounced, 'and all ye who are guilty, for this the Lord hath said concerning you, and will perform his word upon you, that the same day ye put his servants to death, shall the day of your visitation pass over you, and ye shall be for ever cursed.' Mary Dyer folded her hands together, and meekly exclaimed, 'The will of the Lord be done.' The bravado of Stevenson the magistrates might disdain; but for the meekness of Mary Dyer they had no reply. Her calm submission enraged the governor. 'Take her away, marshal,' he exclaimed harshly. 'I return joyfully to my prison,' she said. 'You may leave me, marshal, I will return alone.' 'I believe you, Mrs. Dyer,' replied the marshal, 'but I must do as I am commanded.'

"The prisoners were brought out to the place of execution. Wilson attended the procession: a circumstance to be recorded as marking the hearty concurrence of the New England clergy in these dreadful scenes. Wilson gloried in his work. On the morning of the execution there had been some discussion with the magistrates as to the way in which the prisoners should be dealt with. 'Hang them,' exclaimed Wilson, 'or else'—and he drew his finger across his throat as if to intimate that assassination in prison might be less troublesome than a public execution. The victims ascended the scaffold, after affectionately embracing one another, and each in turn then bore an exulting testimony to the joy which had taken full possession of their souls. Robinson called upon the spectators to bear witness that 'he died for testifying to the light of Christ.' Stevenson's last words were, 'This day we shall be at rest with the Lord.' Mary Dyer walked between her two companions. 'Are you not ashamed to walk thus hand in hand with two young men?' said the marshal, with unfeeling insolence. 'No,' said she, 'this is to me the hour of the greatest joy I could have in this world. No eye can see, nor ear hear, nor tongue utter, nor heart understand, the sweet incomes and refreshings of the Spirit of the Lord, which I now feel.' The executioner proceeded and her companions died. She continued to stand unmoved, her clothes carefully adjusted, her eyes bandaged, the rope around her neck, and tied to the beam above her. At this instant a reprieve arrived, and she was taken down. She neither shrieked, nor swooned, nor wept. She stood still, and calmly told the agitated crowd, that unless the magistrates would annul their wicked law, she would rather die. She saw, no doubt, that otherwise the scaffold would one day claim her as its prey, and had no desire to return to a life of suffering, and face a second death upon the gallows. The bodies of Robinson and his fellow-martyr were cut down, stripped naked, and thrown into a hole beneath the gallows

by the hangman, with something more than his professional brutality. None of their friends were permitted to interfere.

"Mary Dyer was again banished to Rhode island, attended by a guard; and when the guard left her she returned again to Boston. Once more she was sentenced to be hanged. The trial was short, and not wanting in simplicity. Governor Endicot again presided. He asked her, in the first place,—willing, it is said, to afford an opportunity for evasion to the prisoner—whether she were the same Mary Dyer who had been previously before the court?

" 'I am the same Mary Dyer.'

" 'Then you own yourself a quaker?'

" 'I own myself to be reproachfully called so.'

" 'Then I must repeat the sentence once before pronounced upon you.' And he repeated the sentence.

" 'That is no more than thou saidst before.'

" 'But now it is to be executed; therefore prepare yourself for nine o'clock to-morrow.'

"Her husband—for though still young and beautiful, Mary Dyer was a wife and the mother of several children—interceded for her life. He had been separated from her while she was in Rhode Island, and was not privy to her return; indeed he was not a quaker. With the deep pathetic eloquence with which nature alone pleads, he wrote to her iron-hearted judges, and concluded thus—after first acknowledging 'her inconsiderate madness'—'I only say this: yourselves are, or have been, or may be, husbands and wives: so am I: yea, to one most dearly beloved. Oh! do not deprive me of her, but I pray give her to me once again. Pity me! I beg it with tears.' But his tears flowed in vain.

"The next day the scaffold was again erected upon Boston common, a mile away from her prison. She was strongly guarded, and before her and behind drums were continually beaten; for the eloquence of the dying is known to be imperishable. When she had ascended the scaffold, Wilson, the fanatic minister, was again at his post. 'O Mary Dyer,' he cried, 'repent, repent.' 'Nay, man,' she answered calmly, in words in which a puritan must have felt a keen rebuke, 'I am not *now* to repent.' She was again reproached with her pretended visions. She replied, and her peaceful demeanour seemed almost to explain her meaning, 'I have been in paradise many days.' The executioner performed his office; Mary Dyer was no more; and the crowd dispersed: but the brand of that day's infamy will never disappear from the annals of Massachusetts, nor from the story of the pilgrim fathers."—Pp. 320-324.

There is another case, that of William Leddra, related by Mr. Marsden, almost equally painful; but we must content ourselves with referring to the work itself for this and several similar instances. It is a subject in relation

to which all commentary would be unnecessary, were it not that in the denunciations of Catholic intolerance with which the public is so often entertained, all notice of these cruelties is not alone studiously avoided, but, by the care which is taken to represent intolerance as the peculiar vice of Popery, is at least inferentially denied.

The closing chapters of the *History of the Early Puritans* are devoted to the Laudian controversy; but this is a passage of English history so familiar to every student, and Mr. Marsden's narrative contains so little evidence of research, and so little originality of view, that we do not think it necessary to enter into it at length. We may say the same of the entire of his second volume, which contains the *History of the Later Puritans*, beginning with the commencement of the Civil War in 1642, and ending with the passing of the Act of Uniformity, and the ejection of the non-conforming clergy in 1662. The highest merit to which the writer can claim is that of having condensed into an orderly and tolerably agreeable narrative, the substance of the facts contained in the ordinary histories of the period.

We must repeat, in reference to the *History of the Later Puritans*, what we have already said of the earlier history: it has no pretension to the character of a theological history of their doctrine, or of the controversies in which they were engaged. On the all-important Laudian epoch it is miserably meagre. The chapter on the Westminster Assembly is somewhat more interesting; but it is deficient in precision and deals too much in generalities to satisfy a theological reader. Nor can we think that the work is likely to prove a useful or practical guide in those doctrinal enquiries which of late years in England have formed the great object, and have supplied the ordinary inspiration, of almost every historical investigator.

Every new controversy, indeed, that arises, serves but to show more clearly, that the only safe and satisfactory guide to the doctrinal character of the English Church is to be found in her own dogmatical and liturgical formularies. And it is therefore that we welcome with so much satisfaction every effort to facilitate this most important study, and to bring it within the reach, not only of the theological students, but of all readers possessed of ordinary intelligence. Mr. Hardwick's "*History of the Articles*," although we must dissent, of course, from most of its views

of Catholic controversy, is not only a great advance on the spirit of the older treatises, but is far more complete and satisfactory, as a scientific history of the doctrinal changes of which the various modifications of the articles were the exponents, and of the discussions and controversies which resulted in these successive modifications. The same may be said with even more truth of Mr. Procter's "History of the Prayer Book." Although very decidedly anti-Roman in its tone, we gladly accept it as a substitute for the dull and dreary dogmatism of Wheatley. It presents in a popular and agreeable narrative, the history of those variations to which so much attention has been directed during the late eventful controversies; and while it contains a very careful, learned, and scholarlike exposition of these changes, it also furnishes a most valuable commentary on the successive texts of the formularies themselves, as they are exhibited either in the original editions, or in the useful manuals of Bulley and Keeling. Even confining ourselves to the subject of Puritan history, the appendix to the second chapter furnishes a most important supplement to the narrative of Mr. Marsden; while it also places in the clearest light the influence exercised on the Anglican Prayer-book by the foreign Reformers. A similar appendix to the third chapter fills up another very serious omission of Mr. Marsden, by a detailed review of the various Puritan editions of the Prayer-book, together with an exposition of the doctrinal discussions which led to these departures from the established form. But for the general controversies between Catholics and the Church of England, the value of the work will be felt still more sensibly. The chapters on the Burial-Service (p. 394), and on the Ordinal (p. 410), are amongst the best popular evidences with which we are acquainted of the 'variations of Anglicanism.'

Nor can we pass from this subject without alluding with warm approval to the excellent work of Father Waterworth, as the very best example we could offer of the importance of the history of the Anglican Formularies, and of the practical advantage which may be derived from it for the purposes of controversy. His chapter on the Articles, that upon the Liturgies, and that upon the Homilies, are full of most interesting and instructive information. They illustrate in detail every principle as to the twofold character of Anglicanism which we have endea-

voured to demonstrate, nor is it possible to read them, without a full conviction that every incident in the early history of Anglicanism—all her struggles with the Puritan element—all her concessions to its invading spirit—are but so many forms of that weak and vacillating tendency, by which she ever sought to comprehend as large a number of believers as possible within her ample formularies; which sacrificed theological exactness to human policy, and converted the stern precision of doctrinal truth into the loose and stammering vagueness of an insidious compromise.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*Growth in Holiness; or, the Progress of the Spiritual Life.*
By FREDERICK W. FABER, D. D. Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby, Richardson and Son, 1855.

It would be presumptuous in us, and a simple misleading of our readers, if we professed to give an analysis of this work in such a notice as the present, or even to say anything which could enhance the idea of its value. Fortunately such an attempt is unnecessary, for the name of Father Faber is a sufficient recommendation; his writings are amongst those most dearly and universally prized by Catholics. The many readers of the “All for Jesus” will be anxious for the continued and progressive teaching of its venerable Author. All Catholics will see the importance of this work, in which, as Father Faber himself says, “Every sentence, and frequently each clause of a sentence, is a judgment on matters about which all pious Catholics have a more or less formed opinion”.....which is an attempt “to harmonize the ancient and modern spirituality of the Church, with something, perhaps, of a propension to the first, and to put it before English Catholics in an English shape, translated into native thought and feeling, as well as language.”—pref.

II.—*Abridgment of the History of England*. By JOHN LINGARD, D.D. With continuation from 1688 to the reign of Queen Victoria. Adapted for the use of schools. By JAMES BURKE, Esq., M.A., Barrister at Law. London: Dolman, 1855.

A judicious and agreeable abridgment was all that was wanting to complete the mission of the great Catholic historian of England. To riper students of every class, Dr. Lingard's larger history has long been available; and the many editions of various forms in which it has been reprinted, have made it universally accessible of late years. But the young have hitherto been almost entirely excluded from the fruits of his research and impartiality; and even in Catholic schools of high name, until very recently, the first lessons of English history were drawn from the old and contaminated sources. More than one abridgment, it is true, had appeared, but they were deficient in that clearness and simplicity, and especially in that lively and dramatic character which are essential in a narrative intended to interest the young imagination, and to stimulate the unpractised memory.

Mr. Burke's abridgment, in these particulars, is completely successful. He has adopted the wise expedient of retaining as far as possible the language of the admirable author whom he undertakes to abridge; and while he, of course, condenses the facts into a uniform and unbroken history, he has preserved many descriptive scenes, sketches of character, and remarkable narratives, in the very words of the original history. The result is a degree of elegance and of animation, quite unusual in such a compendium, and which, in truth, is almost unattainable without some such expedient, unless where, as in the case of Sismondi, the compendium is drawn up by the writer's own hand.

The continuation is, of course, extremely brief, but it appears careful and judicious, and we do not hesitate to pronounce the work, as a whole, one of the most valuable additions to our scanty school literature which we have met with for many years.

III.—*The Seven Words spoken by Our Lord on the Cross*. From the German of the Rev. Dr. Veitch. London: T. Jones, 1855.

This little book contains impressive reflections on the consummation of the Redemption, which will be welcome to our Catholic readers.

IV.—*Logic ; or the Science of Inference.* By JOSEPH DEVEY. (Bohn's Library.) London : Henry G. Bohn. 1854.

We had occasion in a recent article, on the study of Logic in England, to animadvert upon the anti-religious tendency, half avowed, half unconscious, but nevertheless, quite unmistakeable, by which many late contributions of English scholars to this science are distinguished. It is pleasant to be able to welcome in the excellent popular treatise now before us a marked exception to this prevailing characteristic. We are glad to recognize in Mr. Devey's work not only a disposition (in common with all the really profound writers upon this subject), to acknowledge the merits of the old scholastic writers, whom it once was the fashion indiscriminately to decry, but a seeming general sympathy with catholic principles and catholic views. It is not merely that he has done justice to the merits of some of our modern catholic logicians, Ubaghs, Galluppi, Genovesi, etc. ; that he has taken occasion, in more than one place, to draw illustrations from catholic doctrines, and to expose the unsoundness and fallacy of more than one anti-catholic prejudice. And we rejoice still more to observe that the bent of his mind in discussing many of the leading controversies among logicians, is commonly towards that view of the question which is most in accordance with catholic principles and catholic notions. We allude particularly to his remarks on "Analysis and Synthesis," on "Nominalism and Realism," on "Authority as a source of Evidence," and (more obscurely but yet observably) on "Criteria of Evidence."

The same spirit is still more noticeable in the "Book on Fallacies," which contrasts very favourably in this particular with Archbishop Whateley's book on the same subject, referred to in a former article.

As a Treatise of Logic, for popular use, therefore, we do not hesitate to recommend it in preference to any other in the English language. The rules and explanations are simple and intelligible, and, nevertheless, are sufficiently technical ; combining accuracy with as much of ease of style as can be attained in a purely scientific treatise. We particularly recommend the chapter on syllogisms, in which the new canon of "mediate inference" is extremely well explained, and applied (as alone it can practically be

applied) through the old General Rules of the school logicians.

One of the great merits of Mr. Devey's treatise, indeed, consists in his availing himself of all the real improvements of modern writers, but, as far as possible, engrafting them upon the old and received systems. But he is no blind follower even of the most distinguished modern names; and, while he admits its value in some particulars, he rejects without ceremony for popular use, Mr. Baynes's "*New Analytic*," ushered in as it is with all the prestige of the authority of the deservedly celebrated Sir W. Hamilton.

We cannot conclude without alluding to the *Historical Introduction* prefixed to the volume. We have seldom seen a greater amount of useful information more agreeably condensed into a few pages.

V.—*An Abridged History of England*, for Catholic Seminaries and Young Persons. By W. F. Mylius. Seventh Edition. London, Dublin, and Derby : Richardson and Son.

We are glad to see the Seventh Edition of this deservedly popular school-book. Its merits are too well known to need a lengthened notice.

VI.—*A History of India under the two first Sovereigns of the House of Taimur, Baber and Humayun*. By WILLIAM ERSKINE, ESQ., translator of the *Memoirs of the Emperor Baber*. 2 vols., 8vo. London : Longmans, 1854.

Those of our readers who give any attention to Oriental literature may recollect the exceedingly curious and interesting autobiography of the Tatar conqueror of India, Baber, a translation of which was published many years since by the Oriental Translation Society, and attracted much attention from all literary men of the time. The subject of that autobiography is the older of the two sovereigns, whose reigns form the subject of Mr. Erskine's volumes.

We need scarcely explain that the territory at present subject to British rule in India was invaded and over-run in the sixteenth century by a Tatar army, under Mohammed Baber Padishah, a descendant of the great Timour, and the founder of the Timour dynasty in India, which preceded the period of British occupation. The expedi-

tion was first undertaken in 1524, and terminated two years later in the complete triumph of the Tatar arms at the famous field of Paniput, memorable for more than one decisive event of Indian history. Baber did not live many years to enjoy his conquest, having died in 1530. He was succeeded by his son, Mahommed Humayun, and the Timour dynasty was continued through four successive sovereigns after him, until the establishment of British ascendancy in the Indian peninsula.

The work now before us contains the history of two of those reigns. The author, Mr. Erskine—the translator, conjointly with Mr. Leyden, of Baber's *Autobiography*—had originally projected a complete history of the Timour dynasty in India. The project, however, was interrupted by his death, and the reigns of Baber and Humayun alone were completed.

Independently of the great political importance of the history, we know few lives more interesting, in a purely literary point of view, than that of the great Emperor Baber. The narrative of his early life is full of all the excitement of a romance, and the history of his wars and his administration, are not inferior in interest and instruction to those of the most distinguished conquerors, whether of ancient or of modern times. It was no exaggerated panegyric on the part of the translator of his *autobiography* to describe him as “one of the most illustrious men of his age, and one of the most eminent and accomplished princes who ever adorned a throne.” Brave, chivalrous, and humane, his wars form an exception to the general characteristics of savage warfare. His legislation was far beyond its age. His private character, though not exempt from the stains which are almost inherent in the position which he occupied, was not disgraced by any of the enormities which would seem all but inseparable from the possession of absolute power in the East. A lover of letters himself, he was a generous patron of literature in his court; and there are few sovereigns among the many who have aspired to literary reputation,—who have established higher claims than those of Baber, as they rest upon his poetry and the *autobiography* already described.

The life of Humayun, with less of personal interest, has, perhaps, more of political importance.

The work of Mr. Erskine is executed with much care and research, and though it makes no pretension to bril-

liancy or elegance, is marked by much simplicity, and an excellent and judicious order.

VII.—*The Juvenile Annual; or, Short Stories for Little Children.*
Dublin, J. Duffy, 1853.

It is a difficult thing to write pure and appropriate Children's books, and, albeit, frequently an unappreciated service even when well done. To perform such a task it is necessary for the writer to become a child again—a virtuous, intelligent, and experienced child—acquainted with good and evil, and able to present them, as in a mirror, for the contemplation and guidance of the young. The present volume is from the German of Canon Von Schmid, and comprises one hundred short tales, or scenes of life, all keeping forcibly in view the “Great First Cause.” The sections, or tales, are all short and adapted to the capacities of very young children, and must have a beneficial influence on the minds of its little readers, but those of maturer years will find much pleasure and profit in perusing the home truths of this volume.

- VIII.—1. *Progressive Exercises in Latin Elegiac Verse, First Series*, with References to the Rules of Latin Grammar and Parallel Passages of the Latin Poets, by Edward Walford, M. A., late Scholar of Balliol College, Oxford, (sixth edition,) London, Longmans and Co.
- 2.—*Progressive Exercises in Latin Elegiac Verse, Second Series*, with Reference to the Latin Poets, and to a new “Grammar of Latin Poetry” prefixed to the work, by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.
- 3.—*Hints on Latin Writing*, (third edition,) by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.
- 4.—*Progressive Exercises in Latin Prose Composition*, with a Table of Latin and English Idioms, and References to the Author's “Hints on Latin Writing,” by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.
- 5.—*A Card of the Greek Accents*, (third edition,) by E. WALFORD, M. A. London, Longmans and Co.

The above-mentioned series of Educational works by Mr. Walford is constructed upon the plan of imitation and frequent repetition adopted with such success by the late Rev. T. K. Arnold; the works are considerably simpler than those of Mr. Arnold, and we may add, far cheaper also. Their merits are now very generally recognized in

the English public schools and universities, and we are glad to hear that they are in colleges. We observe that Mr. Walford is also about to publish a "Handbook to the Greek Drama," as well as a series of "Exercises in Hexameter and Lyric Verse," and a series of examination papers, under the title of "Palæstræ Musarum."

IX.—*Leaves from a Family Journal.* From the French of Emile Souvestre. London: Groombridge and Sons, 1855.

A very pleasing translation of one of M. Souvestre's interesting tales.

X.—*A Novena in Honour of the Glorious Mother, St. Teresa of Jesus, with Meditations for Each Day.* Translated from the French, with Litany of the Holy Heart of Joseph. Richardson and Son, London, Dublin, and Derby, 1852.

This excellent little book of devotions, addressed to one of the greatest saints whose names occur in the Church's Calendar, will be welcomed by many a daughter of St. Teresa. It comprises all the necessary instructions for gaining those indulgences which were granted by the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, and the Bishop of Valladolid, to the faithful of their dioceses, who would perform a novena in honour of the Saint. It comprises a suitable meditation and prayer for each day during the novena, together with the Litanies of St. Teresa and St. Joseph. We feel sure that we need say no more in order to recommend it to the faithful. Might we suggest that some few trifling grammatical faults in the former Litany, on pp. 63-4, may be rectified with advantage in a future edition, and that for "who *were*," &c., the more correct "who *were*," may be substituted? Surely, too, instead of "You whose soul," &c., the translator might have adopted the simple form, "Thou whose soul was disengaged," &c.

XI.—*The Apocalypse Fulfilled; or, An Answer to "Apocalyptic Sketches, by Dr. Cumming."* By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ, B.D. London: Longmans, 1854.

The mystery of the Apocalypse seems destined to afford an inexhaustible theme to the commentator. A very curious volume might be made out of the various speculations, which, at different times, have been offered towards

its solution, from the ravings of the wild enthusiasts of the fourteenth century, who built their system upon its basis, to the learned exposition referred to by Mr. Desprez, which gravely explains the Apocalypse as distinctly "foretelling a certain hail-storm, which injured parts of France, in July 13, 1788," and asserts that "a little frog, called the Tractarian heresy, had been heard by St. John to croak all the way from St. Barnabas to Patmos, at the distance of two thousand years!"

Mr. Desprez' volume is a pleasing contrast, both in tone and execution, to the fanatical "Apocalyptic Sketches," against which it is directed. Its purpose is to show that "the key to the Apocalypse is the closing of the Jewish dispensation, the gathering in of the elect, and the coming of the Son of Man." Mr. Desprez discards as "folly, nay, more, impiety," the idea of looking in the Apocalypse for an "exposition of the distant future." His own interpretation is sober, learned, and moderate, and although we are far, of course, from subscribing to its theology as a whole, yet there is much in it with which we heartily sympathize. We gratefully recognize especially the boldness with which he scouts the arbitrary and fanatical anti-Roman expositions of Dr. Cumming, and the writers of his school; and we cordially recommend the Fourteenth Lecture as a most happy and successful demolition of the common basis on which all these expositions are made to rest.

Mr. Desprez makes it plain to every dispassionate student that this basis is not only arbitrarily assumed, but both historically and hermeneutically untenable.

XII.—*Truth's Conflicts and Truth's Triumphs; or, the Seven Headed Serpent Slain.* A Series of Essays, with an Allegorical Refutation of some chief Errors of the Day. By STEPHEN JENNER, M.A. 8vo. London: Longmans, 1854.

As Mr. Jenner is a gentleman of allegorical tastes, it is only fair to allow him to state his case in his own fashion.

It appears from Mr. Jenner's Introduction, (pp. 1—22,) that, by some unlucky chance, a serpent made its way into a certain house, and "coiled itself up under a couch, where a man lay down and slept for a length of time, unaware of his danger." Now such was "the effect of the vital warmth" of this singular visitant "upon the

sleeper's brain," that he dreamed "a strange, at first pleasant, at length troubled, dream," the most remarkable incident of which was, that he fancied himself in a gorgeous Puseyite church, where he heard a long ultra-Tractarian sermon! We could hardly wonder, as we read this composition, that acting in conjunction with "the soporific influence" and "peculiar narcotic power" of the serpent, this prosy composition had the effect of holding him fast bound "in the chains of insensibility" until "a heaven-sent messenger touched him on his side, and said, 'Awake, arise, behold the light of day!'" A terrible conflict ensued, in which, with the aid of a "double-edged sword," which he luckily found upon the table, "he succeeded in hacking off the seven heads of this terrible beast;" after which, very naturally, he fell once more into a peaceful and refreshing sleep, in the course of which he was visited by another dream, (pp. 301-30,) which led him into another church, (this time a church of the pure evangelical type,) and introduced him to a second discourse, now, of course, framed on the most approved Low-church principles, and scattering to the winds all the fallacies of its Tractarian predecessor!

In case any of our friends should be unfortunate enough to find this terrible serpent coiled up some winter night under their couch, it is a friendly act to apprise them that the seven "Essays," which Mr. Jenner introduces by means of this ingenious allegory, are "the double-edged sword," described above, and that the maker warrants it to cut off the seven heads of the pestilential beast with unerring certainty, and with the least possible personal trouble on the part of the operator!

XIII.—*Hardwicke's Shilling Peerage*, for 1855, (to be continued annually,) Compiled by EDWARD WALFORD, Esq. M. A., Balliol College, Oxford. London: R. Hardwicke.

We are glad, for the sake of the public convenience, to see this neat and most accurately compiled little pocket volume; but seeing the name of its compiler, we are still more glad, as we are sure *all* our readers will be, to hear that it has obtained an early and rapid sale. Very many who do not care much for a pocket peerage for its own sake, will take an interest in a little work which promises, we trust, to be a permanent source of emolument to a

gentleman who has sacrificed so much, and is so highly respected as Mr. Walford. It will be followed by similar volumes as to the Baronetage and the House of Commons.

XIV.—*Ince's Outlines of English History*, for the use of Schools. London : J. Gilbert, 49, Paternoster-row.

History in general, and English history in particular, has often been called a lie and conspiracy against Catholic truth. We must, however, make an exception from this sweeping censure in favour of the above little work on English History, which must have a surprising sale among the Protestant schools of England, if we may judge from the fact that it has attained to its eighty-third thousand. It is fair and impartial, and strikes us as the best book of its kind for young persons, as it is free from all those anti-Catholic remarks which disfigure the pages of all our most popular manuals.

XV.—*Father Rowland ; or, the Force of Truth*. London, Dublin and Derby, Richardson and Son.

This little story has long been a popular Catholic tale in North America, and the present edition, we welcome very cordially in England. Our esteemed contemporary, the *Rambler*, has been suggesting the formation of Catholic Lending Libraries, attached to the various missions in England and Wales ; and we think that, whenever it publishes a further list of useful books for plain and simple people, which might be added to such libraries with advantage, the Editor will not fail to find a place for "Father Rowland." The little work is edited, and has been enlarged by a Catholic bishop, and is published at a low price such as will secure for it a wide circulation. The story is one especially adapted to come home to the hearts of such persons as have been brought up in ignorance of the bigotry against the Catholic Faith.

XVI.—*The Last Earl of Desmond ; a Historical Romance of 1599-1603*. 2 vols., 8vo. Dublin : Hodges and Smith, 1854.

Since the first movement for the revival, or rather the creation, of Irish national literature, which began some years ago, we have imagined to ourselves, as one of

the most powerful auxiliaries in popularizing the undertaking, a series of historical novels on subjects selected from Irish history. We have looked indulgently, therefore, on every effort in that direction, and have thought tenderly of all short-comings in the performance, in consideration of the end towards which it was directed.

There are limits, however, even to the largest toleration; and we are forced to say that "*The Last Earl of Desmond*" lies far beyond its boundary line. It is ill-conceived, ill-planned, and ill-written. With the single exception of the Earl himself, there is not one Irish character of which, as Irishmen, we are not ashamed. It presents cunning, coarseness, vulgarity, selfishness, treachery, and falsehood, as the moral characteristics of the Irish of the period; and its only representative of their religion is a clumsy reproduction of the old stereotyped bugbear of the No-popery novelist—a false, crafty, and thoroughly unprincipled Jesuit.

We think it necessary to notice these things as a caution to those who might possibly (like ourselves) be misled by the title. As for the book itself, its caricature of the Irish people is beneath refutation, and its calumnies upon their religion are below contempt.

XVII.—*Legends of Mount Leinster*. By HARRY WHITNEY PHILOMUTH. Dublin, Kennedy, 1855.

There is a vigour and originality about many of these sketches which would sufficiently recommend the book, even if it had no higher object than to supply the amusement of a leisure hour. But there is a great part of its contents that well deserves to be perused for its own sake. "*Clonmullin and its Traditions*," and "*a Sunday with Father Murphy*," are both excellent after their kind. The writer is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of his theme, and we do not doubt that we shall meet him again before long in the same field of Irish literature.

XVIII.—*A Third Gallery of Portraits*. By GEORGE GILFILLAN. Edinburgh: Hogg, 1854.

Mr. Gilfillan's Portraits are too well known to need any description at our hands. The present series contains sketches of the French Revolutionists, of several eminent

English Preachers, of the most notable members of the new school of Poetry, Smith, Massey, and "Sidney Yendys," together with a miscellaneous collection of the critics, politicians, novelists, and historians of our own time. Each of these sketches might itself furnish matter for a separate criticism, but having already spoken sufficiently of Mr. Gilfillan's general manner, it will be enough for us to say, that his third series of portraits resembles in many particulars of style and tone the former volumes of the series. The sketches of the French Revolutionists are the best and most interesting in the volume.

XIX.—*The Poetry of Christian Art.* Translated from the French of A. F. Rio. London, Bosworth, 1854.

The name of Rio is well known to all lovers of Christian Art; and they will rejoice to see his charming sketch of its rise and development translated into English so well and smoothly, that we perceive no drawback upon the pleasure of reading it.

XX.—*Mahometanism in its Relation to Prophecy ; or an Inquiry into the Prophecies concerning Antichrist, with some Reference to their Bearing on the events of the present day.* By AMBROSE LISLE PHILLIPPS, Esq. London: Dolman. 1855.

We are exceedingly inclined to involve all lay interpreters of prophecy in the sweeping sentence, "that where they are not superfluous they are mischievous." It may be answered perhaps, that by this indiscriminating censure, we do but acknowledge our own incompetence to come to any decision concerning the secrets of futurity. Such—with all humility—we admit to be the fact; and we must, in consequence, decline following Mr. Phillipps through his various speculations; we will only say that he has exercised much thought and ingenuity upon a subject which so generally excites interest and curiosity that we have no doubt of his finding many readers.

XXI.—*Ethel ; or, the Double Error.* By MARIAN JAMES. London: Groombridge and Son, 1854.

There is considerable talent in this novel, but it is not a pleasing one. A small group of figures, strongly and harshly characterized, is thrown into, or rather they place

themselves in situations so painful and so faulty, that they lose that spell upon the feelings which should belong to the personages of fiction, whether good or bad. The story, though slight, is well constructed, and the conception of the three principal characters shows great knowledge of human nature. The passionate love which passes by rapid, yet perfectly natural transition, into the passion for distinction, in the stern powerful young man who enacts the hero;—the rash self-sacrifice, unprincipled and fruitless, of the heroine;—the passion of the half-selfish voluptuary, selfish even while centering his happiness in another, who will at all risks grasp the desire of his heart, and does so in the possession of an unloving bride, who becomes almost immediately a disappointment and a bane to him;—in all this there is much that is forcibly told; and—which is not always the case—the story bears strongly and directly upon the moral it professes to illustrate. Fiction, however, requires lighter graces; and as it is not its primary object to teach, so the instruction which it does convey should be kept in the background. If it be allowable for a novel to create in the mind a tragic interest, it certainly ought not to leave a dreary impression, which we confess to have been in ourselves the result of reading “*Ethel, or the Double Error* ;” ill-omened title! *one* of any magnitude may impart sufficient gloom to any history, whether of truth or fiction.

XXII.—*A Popular Sketch of the Origin and Development of the English Constitution from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* By HENRY RAIKES, M.A. 2 vols. 8vo. London: Dalton, 1851-4.

A popular work on the history of the Constitution is unquestionably a want in our literature. Blackstone’s preliminary Dissertation is now antiquated. De Lolme is superficial and inexact. Hallam’s Constitutional History, with all its undoubted merit, is better suited for the scholar and antiquarian than for the ordinary reader; and on the other hand, the brilliant and striking sketch which forms the introduction to Mr. Macaulay’s History of England, though luminous and comprehensive in no ordinary degree, is too rapid, and descends too little into details, to satisfy the requirements of the careful enquirer.

Mr. Raikes’s publication had its origin in his being requested, several years since, to deliver a course of

lectures for a Mechanics' Institute at Chester, and the materials collected for these lectures have formed the nucleus of his present essay. It is, therefore, as may be supposed, extremely popular in its plan ; but it also bears the marks of extensive and accurate reading.

The first volume comprises the long period from the Anglo-Saxon times to the Reformation. In the second the history is carried down through the Civil War, the Restoration, and the Revolution, to the more peaceful political and social changes of our own day. With but little pretension to originality in his views of the great events of the history of England, and of their influence in originating or modifying the details of the constitutional system, Mr. Raikes's narration is exceedingly terse, orderly, and often striking ; his opinions are in the main solid and judicious ; and they are always put forward with clearness, simplicity, and moderation. The fourth chapter of the first volume on "The Origin of Parliament," and the fourth and fifth chapters of the second volume, which chiefly regard the modification of the representative principle brought about by the Revolution, are especially worthy of commendation ; and the concluding chapter on Jurisprudence will be found a very useful popular summary of the great constitutional principles of the civil and criminal law of England.

In his views of English Ecclesiastical history, Mr. Raikes is an earnest evangelical ; and in his sketch of the Reformation, and of the post-Reformation struggle, not only during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, and still more through the Laudian era, he leans strongly to the Low-church principles ; but although our sympathies, as Catholics, are with many of the views of Anglican controversy to which he is most decidedly opposed, we willingly recognize in his dealing with the subject of our own Church, a disposition to candour and good faith. His views of the several influences of the action of the Mediæval Church are substantially those of M. Guizot ; and in his account of the Reformation in England, though it is strongly Protestant, there is no attempt to disguise the unjust and oppressive measures by which it was accompanied. There is, however, as might be expected in all his inferences and doctrines, a tone of assumption throughout, which, however unconscious on his part, cannot fail to be offensive to a catholic reader.

There is one statement, too, in his sketch of the Elizabethan laws, which we cannot pass without notice. He alleges (i. 301.) that, "all the Romanists who fell in her persecutions, *suffered as traitors not as heretics.*" It would carry us far beyond our prescribed limit to enter into the detailed refutation of this most inconceivable misstatement. We need only refer to any one of our catholic historians, to Lingard, Challoner, Dodd, or Milner, for abundant evidence of its untruth; and it is the more unjustifiable, inasmuch as in his account of the analogous proceedings of Mary in relation to the Protestant zealots of her reign, he represents them, notwithstanding the humorous exposure of the seditious, disloyal and anti-social principles which Mr. Maitland has made, as resting on purely religious grounds.

XXIII.—*What every Christian must know—How to get ready and go to Confession—Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity—Rule of Life, Good Works, Sins, Conscience.* Permissu Superiorum. London, Dublin, and Derby, Richardson and Son, 1854.

Of the many cheap and useful publications which have been issued from the Catholic Press of Derby, from the appearance of the celebrated "Derby Reprints" to the present time, we are inclined to think that none have been more useful, or have produced greater fruit, amongst our own people at least, (for we do not now allude to books of controversy) than such little works as the above, published as they are at an extremely low price. The Catholic body, as such, is notoriously a poor one, and no class has a stronger claim upon us than the very poorest amongst ourselves. We do not, of course, admit the wholesale charges of ignorance brought against us by our adversaries, though the circumstances of many of our people are such that they require every facility that we can possibly afford them for the exercise of their religious duties. The publication at the head of this notice will be found extremely useful to the clergy in many localities. Besides the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, &c., a most excellent and simple Rule of Life is added; and each day of the week is assigned to some particular devotion appropriate to the day. The book is intended for distribution by the Redemptorist Fathers, during their missions. We will only add that such publications are worthy of the sons of S. Alphonsus, and we sincerely hope that it will produce all the good it is so well calculated to effect.

XXIV.—*Tracts on Catholic Unity.* London : Darling, 1851-2.

These tracts, five of which have hitherto appeared at intervals, are written by "Members of the Church of England." The first is entitled "The Providential Direction of the Movement of 1833 towards visible Catholic Unity." The second is a reprint of an "Essay" (published in the last century) "to procure Catholic Communion on Catholic Principles." The third and fourth respectively are, "The one Sacrifice on Many Altars," and "The one Real Presence the Centre of Adoration," while the fifth is a reprint of a sermon by Dr. Pusey, called "Christ in us and we in Him, the Bond of Catholic Unity." We do not desire in any way to check the yearnings after unity felt by those amiable and excellent individuals, who profess to be in earnest in what every Catholic must admit to be a good work; but we feel that after all, if God has given to His Church a centre of unity, and invested that centre with His own infallible guidance, there is but one road to Catholic unity open, and that is by submission to the See of Rome.

XXV.—*Edmund Burke, being First Principles selected from his Writings.* With an Introductory Essay by ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M. A. London, Routledge and Co., 1853.

There are persons who dislike selections from a favourite author; but we consider them very useful. The world, like an individual, increases in wisdom, or at least in knowledge. Many truths which it required intuitive genius to penetrate, and manly courage to defend, are now become a common property, so hackneyed that no genius can give them freshness or flavour. They have done their work, and fall into the lumber-room of learning, and often drag after them the name of him who first held them forth, as torches for the guidance of mankind. That author is happy who finds a genuine admirer to cull from his pages before they are forgotten, the choicest specimens,—such germs as may deserve to be handed down from age to age, so lustrous that they sparkle in any setting which the spirit of the age may give them.

Such a friend has Mr. Montgomery been to Burke; and we are sure that to many of our readers, this judi-

cious selection of Burke's wise, sagacious thoughts, which he enforced with exquisite eloquence, will afford a new and great pleasure. Deep-sighted, experienced, temperate amidst all his fire and greatness of soul, Burke deserves to be still considered as a leader; without vouching for the truth, in a Christian point of view, of all his conclusions,—we may safely say that few men have written so little that can be blamed. We will not give extracts from a volume, the whole of which we warmly recommend: one passage only we must extract, not that it is more beautiful than many others, but on account of its peculiar application to the circumstances of the present time.—p. 255.

“Never was there a jar or discord between genuine sentiment and sound policy. Never, no, never, did nature say one thing and wisdom say another. Nor are sentiments of elevation in themselves turgid and unnatural. Nature is never more truly herself than in her grandest form. The Apollo of Belvedere (if the universal robber has yet left him at Belvedere,) is as much in nature as any figure from the pencil of Rembrandt, or any clown in the rustic revels of Teniers. Indeed, it is when a great nation is in great difficulties that minds must exalt themselves to the occasion, or all is lost. Strong passion, under the direction of a feeble reason, feeds a low fever, which serves only to destroy the body that entertains it. But vehement passion does not always indicate an infirm judgment. It often accompanies, and actuates, and is even auxiliary to a powerful understanding; and when they both conspire and act harmoniously, their force is great to destroy disorder within, and to repel injury from abroad. If ever there was a time that calls on us for no vulgar conception of things, and for exertions in no vulgar strain, it is the awful hour that Providence has now appointed to this nation. Every little measure is a great error; and every great error will bring on no small ruin. Nothing can be directed above the mark that we must aim at; everything below it is absolutely thrown away.”

XXVI.—*The Thistle and the Cedar of Lebanon*. By Habeeb Risk Allah Effendi, &c., &c. London, Madden, 1854.

This is a taking title, and is, together with a showy binding, and the portrait of a very handsome gentleman in the title page, the chief recommendation of the volume. Perhaps we should except the glowing eulogiums upon some five hundred matchless and exalted individuals, who have honoured the author with their especial favour, and whose gratitude, we presume, has carried the book into a

second edition. For, in sober earnest, it has no merit; a book of travels it cannot be considered, as the author makes a point of passing over every place which has been described by previous travellers. It may be called a sketch of the author's life and opinions, with which are mingled some few interesting traits of Syrian customs; but the former of these subjects has not (in our opinion) sufficient importance to engross much attention, and the latter lack the piquancy of a good style to set them off. With a large party there would be a recommendation, doubtless, in the extreme anti-Catholic feeling which pervades the work; but even this is enforced in a clumsy manner, which cannot be very gratifying. As, for instance, the author describes with bitter ill-humour, and under the express designation of the "insidious arts of Rome," the unremitting, generous charities of the numerous Catholic convents in Syria and Palestine, and the excellence of the Catholic schools, and proceeds in the same page to admit, that, "alas! not even in Beyrout can the English boast of ever so mean an establishment for the exercise of charity:" (p. 376,) upon which subject, and upon the necessity of sending out medical missionaries, (this would be by no means considered as an "insidious art,") he lectures his friends for at least the space of seven pages. Will it be believed that after this, Allah Effendi laboriously explains the title of his work by pointing out the English Church as "the Cedar of Lebanon," and the Catholics as "the wild beast" of the present day in Lebanon, which is "passing by and treading down the humble and unsupported Thistle," (p. 374,) id est, the Greek Church? We make our Protestant friends a present of the author's advocacy, his similes, and in general of his book.

XXVII.—*Political Sketches; Twelve Chapters on the Struggles of the Age.* By CARL RETSLAG, Dr. PHIL, of Berlin, late Professor in the University of Rostock. London: Theobald, 1854.

These lectures are exceedingly well worth reading; faulty they are no doubt, for with all his acuteness Dr. Retslag has missed the clue in the difficulties of his subject. What theories can a man form as to past history,—what conjectures as to the future fate of empires, to whom the Catholic Church is simply an inconvenience,—an

eccentric exception to all the rules of common sense,—a hindrance upon the march of events—a thing to be got rid of? As it not only cannot be got rid of, but cannot be kept in the back-ground in the discussion of any single question, it is evident into what shifts and falsehoods the clearest headed man must be driven to escape this monster difficulty; and our author has his full share of these. Except, however, where it is turned aside by this subject, the judgment of Dr. Retslag is sound, and his observations valuable. As a foreigner he has means of judging of those under-currents of feeling which the foreign press does not fully express. The necessity of curbing the power of Russia, and the paramount importance of Germany upon European politics, are points upon which mankind are now well agreed; but the complication of interest and feeling, arising between the different German nationalities,—the mutual distrust which exists between the people and their rulers, and the way in which Russian influence pervades and affects the whole of Germany, are points upon which a German can give much useful information.

XXVIII.—*Ione's Dream, and other Poems.* By JANE EMILY HERBERT. London: Pickering, 1853.

We cannot bestow much praise on these poems. The paucity of thought in them is remarkable; a very few pages might contain every idea in the book, and these are lost in a glitter of words, a maze of epithets; they are, moreover, so involved in lengthy phrases and false versification, as quite to defy an investigation, which, indeed, they would ill repay.

XXIX.—*Gahan's History of the Bible*, interspersed with Moral Reflections and Instructive Lessons. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son.

This is a new edition of the well known work, *Reeves' History of the Bible*, and has been published in a cheap form for the purpose of more general use in our Catholic schools. The late Pastoral Letter of the Archbishop and Bishop of the province of Westminster, as our Catholic readers doubtless remember, dwells very earnestly on the great and pressing need of erecting Catholic schools in every mission, and of providing for the children a better

education both religious and secular. And, indeed, if it were for no higher reason, we might plead for the introduction of a good class book on Scripture History on one ground; namely, that as Catholics, we cannot consent to the desecration of the Holy Bible, by placing it as a common text-book and lesson-book, to be irreverently thumbed and tossed about in a village school. But the book is further necessary, in order to imbue our Catholic children, and especially those of poor parents, with right and proper ideas on the subject of the Old Testament, and the true relation of the children of Israel, their typical rites, customs, and shadowy sacrifices, with the good tidings and realities which stand as their antitypes in the New Testament. We can confidently recommend this little book as likely to contribute to so good an end.

XXX.—*The Use of Books.* In Two Lectures to the Cork Young Men's Society. By JOHN GEORGE MACCARTHY, President. Cork: O'Brien, 1855.

We have not for a long time read a lecture, on a purely literary topic, with more pleasure than we have derived from the perusal of these brilliant and effective addresses. There is a grace and vigour in the style, a manly originality in the sentiments, and a healthy and natural simplicity in the tone,—qualities, the importance of which we gladly recognize in a lecturer, who, from his position as president of a Society, and from the influence which it seems likely to secure for him, may be looked to as a model by the young men with whom he is associated.

We had marked more than one passage for extract, both as specimens of the author's style, and for the sake of the solid and useful views which they put forward. But the necessities of space compel us to be content with a general but most cordial commendation of the manner in which this very important and practical subject is discussed.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1855.

ART. I.—*History of the United States of America, from the Discovery of the American Continent.* By GEORGE BANCROFT. London: Routledge and Co., 1851.

IT is related that a meek member of a certain peaceful body who would not raise his arm in anger against either man or beast, having found a dog upon his premises, quietly remarked, "I will not kill thee, but I will give thee a bad name," and thereupon opening his door, and turning out the animal, exclaimed, "Mad dog!" The cry was immediately taken up by the passers by in the street, and the poor dog was hooted, kicked, pelted, shot at, pursued, and run down to death by the alarmed populace. Somewhat akin to this has, even in our own days, been the mild treatment of Catholics in liberal England. They are not persecuted, they are only calumniated; no man lifts his hand, but how many an evil tongue is moved against them. Instead of being hung, drawn, and quartered at Tyburn, they are merely blackened, vilified, and abused at Exeter Hall. Their goods and chattels are not forcibly abstracted from them, but the opportunity of adding to their goods and chattels is quietly abstracted from them, by a careful and religious Protestant abstinence from dealings with or employment of them. They are not deprived of their liberty by the imprisonment of their persons, they are merely deprived of *fair play in the struggle of life*. We do not say they are thus treated by *all* Protestants. But how many who are held up as patterns of religious fervour and Protestant virtue, habitually and systematically speak of their Catholic fellow-countrymen in terms which, like the cry of mad dog, exasperate the feelings of the multitude against them,

and cause all the ordinary walks of industrial life in England to be, if not closed, at least to them paths of peculiar ruggedness and difficulty, and too often of severe neglect and destitution. Has a Catholic professional man, (either in law or medicine,) a fair chance with his Protestant competitor? Has not a Catholic shopkeeper some reason to fear letting his creed be known lest it injure his custom, no matter what may be the quality of his wares, or the tariff of his prices? How seldom can a servant, however good and trustworthy, secure a place in a respectable Protestant family, if he or she have the misfortune to be a Catholic. And as to conversion, the adoption of any new faith, however opposite in principle or contradictory in creed, a change from Dissent to the Church of England, or from the latter to anything, if it be but Protestant, is tolerated, and either approved or regarded as a matter of indifference; indeed, the frequenting a Protestant church one Sunday, a Dissenting chapel the next, and a Wesleyan tabernacle on the third, is not a very unusual circumstance, the doctrines seeming rather immaterial, provided only they have the nominal stamp of Protestantism upon them; but a conversion from any one of the numerous, or rather innumerable forms of Protestantism to the Catholic faith, however it may be judged in another and a better world, is assuredly regarded in this inferior world of ours as an act of insanity, or something worse, which exposes the individual who has followed the dictates of his conscience, to the loss of private friends, the loss of business connections, and too often to exclusion from that place round the family hearth which he (or she it may be) had enjoyed from childhood. We say not these things vaguely, but could, from even one individual's observation, supply personal instances of each of the privations thus generally indicated. And yet this Protestant England, which in speeches and pamphlets, in the senate and on the platform, in private converse and on all great and public occasions, is ever vaunting and belauding the right of private judgment, thus punishes those of its subjects who exercise that right in favour of Catholicism, and whilst it glorifies itself for what it presumes to consider its peculiar privilege of liberty of conscience, it practically excludes from the amenities and advantages of the social system those who use that liberty to become or remain Catholics.

It is true that all the old punishments for conscience sake have recently been swept from our statute book, though some others have still more recently been inserted, but are the facts such as to justify Protestant England in all the self-exaltation in which she so swaggeringly indulges, as if she were the originator and maintainer of Religious Toleration ? Still more, does it lie in the mouth of Protestant England to taunt foreign Catholic countries with intolerance ?

We venture to assert, 1. That England never has established, and does not now maintain, Religious liberty *upon principle*.

2. That there is at least equal intolerance at the present moment in foreign Protestant as in foreign Catholic countries,

3. That Catholics were the *first* to establish the principle of religious toleration, and practically to govern a country in accordance with it. This we undertake to establish on exclusively Protestant authority.

4. That after Catholics had thus established religious toleration, and made their country an asylum for Protestants of every denomination, these Protestants, when they eventually acquired power, passed an intolerant law in that very country against Catholics ; the proof of this also will rest upon Protestant authority alone.

And 5. That at the very time when Catholic emigrants were thus establishing religious toleration as the distinguishing mark of their settlement in the continent of America, neighbouring settlements, both by Episcopalian and by Puritan Protestants, even by exiles from persecution at home, were avowedly based upon the principle and practice of religious persecution.

1. and 2. Those who have arrived at middle life perfectly well recollect that, though many illustrious statesmen supported Catholic emancipation in this country upon principle, it was carried as *a measure of policy* ; that we did not obtain our "just and equal rights" merely because they were just and equal rights, but because there happened to be a large number of us, and we were not content to remain without them. The ministers who had the wisdom to propose the measure of emancipation, were denounced as "expediency men ;" and if it had been argued on the ground of principle alone, we fear that British Catholics might have remained to this day unemancipated. Does

it, under these circumstances, lie in the mouth of England to taunt any foreign Catholic countries with intolerance ? If England has established religious liberty *upon principle*, (from pure love of religious liberty, and upon no other motive,) then she might be entitled to exalt the principle, and to inquire why certain foreign Catholic countries have not also vindicated it. But if England has established religious liberty as *an expedient policy*, then her taunting others for not adopting the principle is but an impertinence, and England is only entitled to inquire whether the circumstances of those other countries make a similar *policy expedient there*. May not the Catholics of certain foreign countries fairly say to England, "It was not the pure love of religious liberty, and that alone, which made you pass your Catholic Emancipation Bill. You had in your population a large number of Catholics, and this it was which made it *politic* for you to pass your Emancipation Act. We have no such number of Protestants in our population, the circumstances with us are quite different, and we will therefore imitate your example by deferring our Emancipation Bill till such time as similar circumstances in our own country require from us a similar policy."

Singularly enough, the very men who, when the British Emancipation Bill was under discussion, were its most intolerant opponents, are now with ludicrous inconsistency the most impassioned declaimers against some foreign Catholic governments for not doing what they would then have prevented our English Protestant government from doing if they could. The now platform man at Exeter Hall, who vehemently declaims *for* a Protestant Relief Bill by foreign Catholic governments, was but a few years ago an equally vehement declaimer *against* the Catholic Relief Bill in Protestant England, and has even recently fallen into the argumentative absurdity of suggesting, that if the British Catholics did not behave themselves more in conformity with his will and pleasure, he would, if he could, have them unemancipated. Is it not obvious that when the cry against religious persecution resounds from Exeter Hall, it is not so much religion which is loved as Catholicism which is hated, that persecution is not there protested against when it seems to extend or preserve what they deem the pure light of the Gospel, but becomes an intolerable outrage only when the Protestant

weapon is seized by a Catholic hand. The very men who so loudly clamoured for religious liberty in Tuscany, would not have given us religious liberty in England if they could have prevented it; they struggled against it to the utmost, conceded it reluctantly, and would deprive us of it at any moment if they could do so with safety.

But this feeling is not confined to the bigots of Exeter Hall. A singular illustration of the gross and almost incredible inconsistency of those who clamoured against persecution by Catholics, whilst they quietly ignored or openly commended persecution by Protestants, can be supplied by a reference to the *Times* newspaper. The *Times*, which almost exhausted the vituperative powers of the English language in its denunciations of Catholic Tuscany, what kind of terms did it apply to persecution when practised by the Protestant Prussian government? If compelled to notice Protestant persecution at all, we might naturally expect that it would in such a case most considerately and delicately appreciate how far religious freedom might involve any element of political or social danger, that it would describe the coercive rigour of Protestantism in mild and palliating terms, and, if quite unable to commend, make the largest possible allowances for the amount of provocation, and the necessity of precaution, treat the offence as an excess of prudence, erroneous perhaps in principle, but kind in intention and mild in action, and address to it the most gentle terms of expostulation. So much deviation from strict consistency we might perhaps expect from the ordinary weakness of poor human nature, but to find it openly declared that what is detestable in Tuscany is commendable in Prussia—to find the *Times*, whilst its burning words against Catholic persecution were yet thrilling in the Protestant bosom of England, actually praising the persecuting conduct of the Prussian Protestant government, and declaring that the attempt of Catholic priests to preach in districts where Prussian Protestants preponderate in number, is “an aggressive encroachment on the Protestant church, which a Protestant state cannot satisfy or submit to without sacrificing its character and standing as such,” is an outrage upon consistency, and a reckless hardihood of partisanship, the possibility of which it is difficult to believe, and the fact of which it is—we say it in sober sadness—mournful to contemplate.

In the *Times* of 17th Jan., 1852, the *Times* correspondent at Berlin writes:

“The government had found it necessary, in the course of last year, to call the attention of the provincial authorities to the agency of Catholic missionaries in localities where Protestant populations had the preponderance, and to point out where their public preaching was of a nature of itself, or by reason of attendant circumstances, calculated to cause a breach of the peace, or where in any way a political or social misdemeanour was thereby committed, the authorities were required to interfere to prevent such occurrences, even if necessary, by forbidding the missionaries the spot. The previous toleration on the part of the authorities was not reprovèd, and the greatest discretion and delicacy in the execution of these orders enforced upon them. Further, the government had found reason to refuse to a student of divinity its permission to visit the Collegium Germanicum of Rome, (which it was empowered to do by an edict of the late king,) and in general to refuse to Jesuits and other clerical persons who had studied in Jesuit establishments, permission to take up their abode in Prussia. The motion made by the Baron Von Waldbolt is for an address to the king petitioning him to reverse these orders, on the ground that the first of them is in direct contravention of the twelfth article of the constitution, which guarantees the freedom of religious confession, the right of association for religious purposes, and of meeting for domestic and public religious exercise, and that the edict of the late king, which was made the ground of action in the second order, has been virtually repealed by certain articles of the constitution quoted; and furthermore, that ministers had themselves adopted this view in their own instructions to the provincial authorities on a previous occasion.”

In Sweden, which is as Protestant as Tuscany is Catholic, a man who does not conform to the established religion of the country is, as Laing states, “an outlaw;” whilst in Prussia, where Catholics exist, but are outnumbered by the Protestant population, the will, if not the same power, to persecute, is manifested, the only difference being as to the prudence of exercising it. The honied modes of expression used by the *Times* correspondent in describing so gross an act of persecution, as to forbid Catholic missionaries to preach in localities where Protestant populations form the majority, is remarkable enough; and as to the pretence of a suggested breach of the peace, it is obvious that neither the Catholic missionaries nor the Catholic minority would be likely to begin

any such breach, so that it amounts in effect to this, that wherever the Protestant majority chose violently to interrupt the preaching of Catholic missionaries, there the officers of government were to "forbid the missionaries the spot." But supposing the missionaries not to go, how would the law be carried out? They must either be banished or sent to prison. If banished, they might return and repeat the offence of preaching, so that obviously the only mode of effectually carrying out the law would be to put them in prison, to treat them like the Madiari. Have the Protestants of England remonstrated with the king of Prussia against this arbitrary edict? Has there been any burst of indignation at Catholic missionaries being thus forbidden to preach in any locality where Protestants happen to preponderate? On the contrary, the *Times* correspondent deals with it as a specimen of Protestant moderation and of Catholic impertinence; it is not in his judgment Protestant persecution but Catholic aggression! His commentary on the transaction is as follows:—

"Though I have been thus particular in stating all the points of the case so soon to be mooted in the Prussian Chambers, I have not done so on account of any particular interest it possesses in itself, so much as because it forms the vanguard of an aggressive host of demands and encroachments on the Protestant church, which a Protestant state cannot satisfy or submit to without sacrificing its character and standing as such. With other tactics suited to the different position it occupies here, the Romish Church is carrying on the same campaign in Prussia as in Ireland."

Comment upon this is superfluous—the reflections it must excite in a candid mind are sufficiently obvious.

We have thus adverted more at large to this specimen of Prussian Protestant persecution, backed and encouraged by the leading English journal, because it may not have been so generally known or have excited so much public attention, but we will only allude to the more notorious fact that Catholics have been, and are at this moment, persecuted in Protestant Sweden, in Protestant Denmark, in Protestant Norway, in Protestant Prussia, and in other Protestant states of the Continent.

And we may add also that that country in Europe which now enjoys the most perfect religious freedom is Catholic Belgium, for there religion is no bar to the enjoyment of any office in the state, even up to royalty

itself; and bishops are allowed, in the exercise of their spiritual functions, to assume, without pain or penalty, any titles they may think proper.

As to Protestant persecution of Catholics in the Protestant countries we have named, it would be beyond the limits of the present article to do more than refer to the works of Samuel Laing, author of *Tours in almost every Country in Europe*, published in 1836, 1839, and 1840, a staunch Protestant, and so far from having the slightest leaning towards Catholicism, rather stiffly opposed to it. Considerations of space forbid any extracts here, and they are tolerably well known. We cannot, however, refrain from copying the opinions which he quotes from Lord Molesworth, who wrote an account of Denmark in 1692, as to the fatal consequences of the union of religious with temporal authority in the temporal sovereign. He says :—

“ That in the Roman Catholic religion there is a resisting principle to absolute civil power, from the division of authority with the heads of the Church at Rome ; but in the north, the Lutheran church is entirely subservient to the civil power, and the whole of the northern people of Protestant countries have lost their liberties since they changed their religion for a better.” “ The blind obedience which is destructive of natural liberty is more firmly established in the northern kingdoms, by the entire and sole dependence of the clergy upon the prince, without the interference of any spiritual superior as that of the Pope among Romanists, than in countries which remained Catholic.”

After furnishing many remarkable instances of tyranny, persecution, and immorality in these Protestant countries, Laing remarks :—

“ The principle that the civil government, or state, or church and state united, of a country is entitled to regulate its religious belief, *has more of intellectual thralldom in it than the power the Popish Church ever exercised in the darkest ages* ; for it had no civil power joined to its religious power. It only worked through the agency of the civil power of each country. The Church of Rome was an independent, distinct, and *often an opposing* power, in every country, to the civil power—a circumstance in the social economy of the middle ages, to which perhaps Europe is indebted for her civilization and freedom; for not being in the state of barbarism and slavery in the east, and of every country, ancient and modern, *in which the civil and religious power have been united in one government*. Civil liberty is closely connected with religious liberty—with the church

being independent of the state, although not exactly in the way our Scotch clergy claim for the church, a church power independent of the civil power. The question being agitated on the Continent as well as at home, deserves consideration. In Germany the seven Catholic sovereigns have 12,074,700 Catholic subjects, and 2,541,000 Protestant subjects. The twenty-nine Protestant sovereigns, including the four free cities, have 12,113,000 Protestant subjects, and 4,966,000 Catholic. Of these populations in Germany, *those which have their point of spiritual government without their states, and independent of them, as the Catholics have at Rome—enjoy certainly more spiritual independence, are less exposed to the intermeddling of the hand of civil power with their religious concerns than the Protestant populations, which, since the Reformation, have had church and state united in one government, and in which each autocratic sovereign is, de facto, a Home Pope.* The church officers of Prussia, in this half century, those of Saxony, Bavaria, and of the smaller principalities, such as Anhalt Coethen, in all of which the state has assumed and exercised power inconsistent with the principles, doctrines, observances, or privileges of the Protestant religion, clearly show that the Protestant church on the Continent, as a power, has become merely an administrative body of clerical functionaries, acting under the orders of the civil power or state. The many able and pious men of the laity, as well as clergy, in Scotland, who contend that this subserviency of the church to the state is not a sound and safe position, for the Christian Protestant religion are in the right, practically as well as theoretically. The power of the state over the religious concerns of its subjects is proved by all history, ancient and modern, to be so adverse to the development of civil liberty, that it may be called the right arm of despotism. It is this power that enslaves the Prussian and Mahomedan populations. It is adverse to the Protestant religion, not merely from the freaks or schemes of autocratic sovereigns endeavouring, as in Prussia, to convert religion into a state machine, an evil which a constitutional government may prevent, but by an evil which no form of government can prevent, by reducing the moral weight of the clergy of a country to that of state-paid functionaries. If the traveller fairly examines the religious and moral influence of the established clergy in Protestant countries, in Sweden, Denmark, England and Scotland, Prussia, Switzerland, he will find it diminished exactly in proportion to the power of the state over the religious concerns of the people, and at its minimum in those despotic states, such as Denmark and Prussia, in which the clergy act merely as functionaries put in by the state to perform certain duties according to certain forms.”

3. 4. 5. Having thus dwelt at rather more length upon the two first divisions of our argument, we will now proceed to the third, fourth, and fifth heads, which may be clearly

established by a few references to the Protestant work whose title is prefixed to this article. To what particular form of Protestantism Mr. Bancroft (late American Minister in this country) is attached we do not know, it is evident, however, from many parts of his work, that he does not labour under any prepossession in favour of Catholicism, and we may therefore presume to quote with confidence whatever the inevitable necessities of truth oblige him to record in their favour. His history, indeed, supplies a concise, correct, and interesting account, not only of the early settlement of the northern division of America, but also of contemporary events in the Old World, and upon the question of religious toleration, it furnishes some very remarkable illustrations. Here we may see specimens of contemporaneous settlements by Protestants and by Catholics, and here, if anywhere, we might expect to find developed the natural tendencies of each. When, in order to establish the first English settlement in North America, "a company of men of business and men of rank, formed by the experience of the brave and ingenious Gosnold, the enthusiasm of Smith, an adventurer of rare genius and undying fame, the perseverance of Hakluyt, the hopes of profit, and the extensive influence of Popham and Gorges, applied to James I. for leave to 'deduce a colony into Virginia,' the monarch promoted the noble work by readily issuing an ample patent." (Vol. i. p. 91.) Gorges was a man of wealth, rank, and influence, Popham was Lord Chief Justice of England, whilst Richard Hakluyt is justly styled the most distinguished of all the assigns of Raleigh and the historian of maritime enterprize.

It will be obvious from this and other parts of Bancroft's narrative of the circumstances which preceded and attended the grant of this first colonial charter for Virginia, and the constitution of a system of local government under it, that it started under apparently the most favourable auspices, was backed by intelligence, rank, and wealth, was not only Protestant in its constituent elements, but embraced much of the best intelligence and intellectual aristocracy of Protestantism, and that here, therefore, if the Reformed religion had any tendency to produce religious toleration, such a product might be expected spontaneously to develope itself. The case, moreover, was not perplexed by many of those conflicting circumstances

which often obstruct the accomplishment of any perfect theory of government; the actual composition of a people, their hereditary or predominant feelings, or prejudices, or habits, usually determine the extent and character of what is practicable, or expedient to be attempted, by the governing power; here, however, a new society had to be formed, the Protestant legislators for which possessed the power of accomplishing their most utopian ideas in whatever direction they tended. Of course religious toleration was one of the essential privileges which it was their first aim to secure! It is singular to observe in such an instance as this, which forms a kind of test to detect and exhibit the presence of religious toleration in Protestantism, if it really existed there, how thoroughly the practice of the Protestant settlers of Virginia differed from the vapouring talk and platform protestations of their Protestant successors in England at the present day. In this Virginian constitution, which may be regarded as a fair pattern of Protestant optimism, Bancroft says:—

“Not an element of popular liberty was introduced into the form of government. *Religion was specially enjoined to be established according to the doctrine and rites of the Church of England*, and no emigrant might withdraw his allegiance from king James, or *avow dissent from the royal creed.*”

This intolerance may probably have had some influence in leading to one useful result; the Catholic Lord Baltimore's experience in the new settlement of Virginia, where he probably went in search of that religious equality which he could not adequately enjoy at home, and which he found denied him in the Protestant colony, may probably have the more inclined him to originate and establish that system of perfect religious toleration, which he afterwards with difficulty accomplished in Maryland, but which its Protestant neighbours did not long allow to continue. Bancroft writes:—

“It was during the period which elapsed between the appointment of Harvey,” (one of the governors of Virginia,) “i. e., about 1628, that Lord Baltimore visited Virginia. The zeal of religious bigotry pursued him as a Romanist, and the intolerant jealousy of Popery led to memorable results. The zeal of the assembly immediately ordered the oaths of allegiance and supremacy to be tendered him. It was in vain that he proposed a form which he was willing to subscribe; the government firmly insisted upon that

which had been chosen by the English statutes, and which was purposely framed in such language as no Catholic could adopt."

But it may be suggested that the exclusive character of the Virginian constitution originated with its royal author, and that if the Protestant settlers there had possessed the power of fashioning their constitution according to their own taste, it would have been far more liberal on all matters appertaining to religion. The settlers *had* that opportunity. Let us see how they exercised it. Referring to the circumstances of the colony after the triumph of the parliament in England, Bancroft remarks :—

"The condition of contending parties in England had now given to Virginia an opportunity of legislation independent of European controul ; and the voluntary act of the assembly restraining religious liberty, adopted from hostility to innovation, rather than from a spirit of fanaticism, or respect to instructions, proves conclusively the attachment of the representatives of Virginia to the Episcopal Church and the cause of royalty. Yet there had been Puritans in the colony almost from the beginning ; even the Brownists were freely offered an asylum. 'Here,' said the tolerant Whitaker, 'neither surplice nor subscription is spoken of ;' and several Puritan families, and perhaps even some of the Puritan clergy, emigrated to Virginia. They were so content with their reception, that large numbers were preparing to follow, and were restrained only by the forethought of English intolerance. We have seen, that the pilgrims at Plymouth were invited to remove within the jurisdiction of Virginia ; Puritan merchants planted themselves on the James River without fear, and emigrants from Massachusetts had recently established themselves in the colony. The honour of Laud had been vindicated by a judicial sentence, and south of the Potowac the decrees of the Court of High Commission were allowed to be valid ; but I find no traces of persecution in the earliest history of Virginia. The laws were harsh : the administration seems to have been mild. A disposition to nonconformity was soon to show itself even in the council. An invitation, which had been sent to Boston, for Puritan ministers, implies a belief that they would be admitted in Virginia. But now the democratic revolution in England had given an immediate political importance to religious sects ; to tolerate Puritanism was to nurse a republican party. It was, therefore, specially ordered, that no minister should preach or teach, publicly or privately, except in conformity to the constitutions of the Church of England, and nonconformists were banished from the colony. The unsocial spirit of political discord, fostering a mutual intolerance, prevented a frequent intercourse between Virginia and New England. It was in vain that the ministers, invited from

Boston by the Puritan Settlements in Virginia, carried letters from Winthrop, written to Berkeley and his council, by order of the General Court of Massachusetts. 'The hearts of the people were much inflamed with desire after the ordinances;' but the missionaries were silenced by the government and ordered to leave the country. Sir William Berkeley was 'a courtier, and very malignant towards the way of the churches' in New England."

We may remark that whatever may, notwithstanding the severe letter of the law, have been at any early period the practically mild treatment of Puritans in Virginia, Catholics, as in the case of Lord Baltimore, experienced no share of this favour there; they whose old English homes ceased to be resting places for them on account of their attachment to the old religion, were always denied an asylum in this part of the New World.

It is singular, also, to observe, that both these varieties of Protestantism (the Church of Englandmen of Virginia, and the Puritans of New England), who alike theoretically based their religion upon the right of private judgment, practically denied the exercise of any such right to each other as well as to Catholics. The more polished Church of England and royalist Virginian banished the Puritans from Virginia, whilst, as we shall soon see, the rugged and righteous Puritan carefully excluded from New England every Protestant who was not addicted to his peculiar expoundings of the text, and both agreed cordially in one only thing, viz., to kick out the Catholics wherever they were found.

Where, then, were these poor Catholics to find a resting place for their weary feet? And when they had found one, would it have been any extraordinary departure from the accustomed workings of human nature if, thus driven from pillar to post, and denied alike at home and in the colonies the privilege of adhering to their old religion, they had sought to form in some quiet nook of the New World, a secluded society where they might worship God in the manner of their forefathers, free from the aggressive intrusion of any of the new Sects, who had invariably and in every part of the world denied them liberty of conscience? So far from acting in this manner, they set up the standard of religious toleration, they moreover acted up to it, they allowed Protestants of every variety and creed to settle freely amongst them, all forms of Christianity were tolerated, until these very Protestants thus hospitably

received and cherished, and allowed to settle and increase in Maryland, eventually, like the frozen snake in the fable, turned upon and bit their benefactor, and, when they at length became strong enough, they denied to their Catholic fellow countrymen that very toleration with which they had been welcomed into the country by the Catholic ancestors of those whom they persecuted.

But we are anticipating. The original colonisation of Maryland by Catholics is a most remarkable historic event, and the circumstances will appear so extraordinary and almost incredible to many of our Protestant readers who have never taken the trouble to enquire and investigate for themselves, how far the current prejudices against Catholicism, which they have imbibed from childhood, have any real foundation in fact, and whose notions about the faith of their forefathers rest probably on no better a foundation than the idea that what every one they know says, and what every one around them believes, must be true, to such we say *our* narrative of the Catholic Settlement of Maryland might appear so suspicious that we prefer to relate it entirely in the language of Bancroft.

He says (vol. i. p. 180):—

“It was the peculiar fortune of the United States, that they were severally colonized by men in origin, religious faith, and purposes, as different as the climes which are included within their limits. Before Virginia could complete its settlements and confirm its claims to jurisdiction over the country north of the Potomac, a new government was erected, on a foundation as extraordinary as its results were benevolent. Sir George Calvert had early become interested in colonial establishments in America. A native of Yorkshire, educated at Oxford, with a mind enlarged by extensive travel, on his entrance into life befriended by Sir Robert Cecil, advanced to the honours of Knighthood and at length employed as one of the two Secretaries of State, he not only secured the consideration of his patron and sovereign, but the good opinion of the world. He was chosen, by an immense majority, to represent in parliament, his native County of Yorkshire. His capacity for business, his industry and his fidelity are acknowledged by all historians. In an age when religious controversy still continued to be active, and when the increasing divisions among Protestants were spreading a general alarm, his mind sought relief from controversy in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church; and, preferring the avowal of his opinions to the emoluments of office, he resigned his place, and openly professed his conversion. King James was never bitter against the Catholics who respected his pretensions as a monarch; Calvert retained his place in the privy

council, and was advanced to the dignity of an Irish peerage. He had, from early life, shared in the general enthusiasm of England in favour of American plantations; and had been a member of the Great Company for Virginia; and, while secretary of State, he had obtained a special patent for the southern promontory of Newfoundland.

“How zealous he was in selecting suitable emigrants, how earnest to promote habits of domestic order and economical industry, how lavishly he expended his estate in advancing the interests of his settlement on the rugged shores of Avalon is related by those who have written of his life. He desired, as a founder of a colony not present profit, but a reasonable expectation; and, perceiving the evils of a common stock, he cherished enterprise by leaving each one to enjoy the results of his own industry.

“But numerous difficulties prevented success in Newfoundland.”

After explaining them, Bancroft proceeds:—

“Lord Baltimore looked to Virginia, of which the climate, the fertility and the advantages were so much extolled.”

How he was received there, or rather how he was expelled thence by the earlier Protestant settlers, has been already related. As Bancroft observes,

“It was evident that Lord Baltimore could never hope for quiet in any attempt at establishing a colony within the jurisdiction of Virginia.”

He looked, therefore, elsewhere.

“The country beyond the Potomac seemed to be as yet untenanted by any but the scattered hordes of the native tribes. The French, the Dutch, and the Swedes, were preparing to occupy the country; and a grant seemed the readiest mode of securing the soil by an English settlement.

“The cancelling of the Virginia patents had restored to the Monarch the ample authority of his prerogative over the soil, he might now sever a province from the colony, to which he had at first assigned a territory so vast; and it was not difficult for Calvert—a man of such moderation that all parties were taken with him, sincere in his character, disengaged from all interests, and a favourite with the royal family—to obtain a charter for domains in that happy clime. The nature of the document itself, and concurrent opinion, leave no room to doubt that it was penned by the first Lord Baltimore himself, although it was finally issued for the benefit of his son.”

We beg especial attention to Bancroft's description of this Catholic Charter.

“The fundamental charter of the colony of Maryland, however it may have neglected to provide for the power of the king, was

the sufficient frank-pledge of the liberties of the colonists, not less than of the rights and interests of the proprietary. The ocean, the fortieth parallel of latitude, the meridian of the western fountain of the Potomac, the river itself, from its source to its mouth, and a line drawn due east from Watkin's Point to the Atlantic,—these were the limits of the territory, which was now erected into a province, and from Henrietta Maria, the daughter of Henry IV. and wife of Charles I., whose restless mind, disdaining contentment in domestic happiness, aspired to every kind of power and distinction, received the name of Maryland.

“The country thus described was given to Lord Baltimore, his heirs and assigns, as to its absolute lord and proprietary, to be holden by the tenure of fealty only, paying a yearly rent of two Indian arrows, and a fifth of all gold and silver ore which might be found. Yet the absolute authority was conceded rather with reference to the crown than the colonists; for the charter, unlike any patent which had hitherto passed the great seal of England, secured to the emigrants themselves an independent share in the legislation of the province, of which the statutes were to be established with the advice and approbation of the majority of the freemen or their deputies.

“Representative government was indissolubly connected with the fundamental charter, and it was especially provided, that the authority of the absolute proprietary should not extend to the life, freehold, or estate of any emigrant. These were the features which endeared the proprietary government to the people of Maryland, and, but for these, the patent would have been as worthless as those of the London Company, of Warwick, of Georges, or of Mason. It is a singular fact, that the only proprietary charters productive of considerable emolument to their owners, were those which conceded popular liberty.

“For the benefit of the colony, the statutes restraining emigration were dispensed with; and at the appointment of the Baron of Baltimore, all present and future liege people of the English king, except such as should be expressly forbidden, might freely transport themselves and their families to Maryland. Christianity was by the charter made the law of the land; *but no preference was given to any sect; and equality in religious right, not less than in religious freedom was assured.* A monopoly of the English fisheries had formerly been earnestly resisted by the Commons of England; to avoid all dispute on this point, Calvert, in his charter, expressly renounced any similar claim. As a Catholic he needed to be free from the jurisdiction of his neighbour; Maryland was carefully separated from Virginia, nor was he obliged to obtain the royal assent to the appointments or the legislation of his province, nor even to make a communication of the results. So far was the English monarch from reserving any right of superintendence in the colony, he left himself without the power to take cognizance of what transpired,

and by express stipulation, covenanted, that neither he, nor his heirs, nor his successors, should ever at any time thereafter, set any imposition, custom, or tax, whatsoever, upon the inhabitants of the province. Thus was conferred on Maryland an exemption from English taxation for ever. Sir George Calvert was a man of sagacity, and an observing statesman. He had beheld the arbitrary administration of the colonies; and, against any danger of future oppression, he provided the strongest defence which the province of a monarch could afford. Some other rights were conferred on the proprietary—the advowson of churches; the power of creating manors, and courts baron, and of establishing a colonial aristocracy on the system of sub-infeudation. But these things were practically of little moment. Even in Europe, feudal institutions appeared like the decrepitude of age, amidst the vigour and enterprise of a new and more peaceful civilization; they could not be perpetuated in the lands of their origin—far less could they renew their youth in America. Sooner might the oldest oaks in Windsor Forest be transplanted across the Atlantic, than the social forms, which Europe itself was beginning to reject as antiquated and rotten. But the seeds of popular liberty, contained in the charter, would find in the New World the very soil best suited to quicken them into life and fruitfulness.

“Calvert deserves to be ranked among the most wise and benevolent lawgivers of all ages. He was the first in the history of the Christian world to *seek for religious security and peace by the practice of justice*, and not by the exercise of power; to place the establishment of popular institutions *with the enjoyment of liberty of conscience*; to advance the career of civilization by recognizing the rightful equality of all Christian sects. *The asylum of Papists was the spot where, in a remote corner of the world, on the banks of rivers which as yet had hardly been explored, the mild forbearance of a proprietary adopted religious freedom as the basis of the state.*”—p. 185.

Before the patent could be finally adjusted and pass the great seal Sir George Calvert died, leaving a name, against which, the breath of calumny has hardly whispered a reproach. The petulance of his adversaries could only taunt him with being “an Hispaniolized Papist.” His son, Cecil Calvert, succeeded to his honours and fortunes. For him, the heir of his father’s intentions not less than of his father’s fortunes, the charter of:—

“Maryland was published and confirmed, and he obtained the high distinction of successfully performing what the colonial companies had hardly been able to achieve. At a vast expense he planted a colony, which for several generations descended as a patrimony to his heirs.

“Lord Baltimore, who, for some unknown reason, abandoned his purpose of conducting the emigrants in person, appointed his brother to act as his lieutenant; and on Friday, the 22nd of November, 1633, with a small but favouring gale, Leonard Calvert, and about two hundred people, most of them Roman Catholic gentlemen and their servants, in the “Ark and the Dove,” a ship of large burden, and a pinnace, set sail for the northern bank of the Potomac. Having stayed by the way in Barbadoes and St. Christopher, it was not till February of the following year that they arrived at Point Comfort, in Virginia; where in obedience to the express letters of king Charles, they were welcomed by Harvey with courtesy and humanity. Clayborne also appeared, but it was as a prophet of ill omen, to terrify the company by predicting the fixed hostility of the natives.”

Leaving Point Comfort, Calvert entered the river now called St. Mary's, which he named St. George's, and about four leagues from its junction with the Potomac, he anchored at the Indian town of Yaacomoco, where he landed, and by arrangement with the natives, occupied one half of their town.

“Mutual promises of friendship and peace were made, so that upon the 25th day of March, *the Catholics took quiet possession of the little place, and religious liberty obtained a home, its only home in the wide world, at the humble village which bore the name of St. Mary's.*”

“Within six months it had advanced more than Virginia had done in as many years. The proprietary continued with great liberality to provide everything that was necessary for its comfort and protection, and spared no cost to promote its interests; expending in the two first years upwards of forty-thousand pounds sterling. But far more memorable was the charter of the Maryland institutions. Every other country in the world had persecuting wars; ‘I will not,’ such was the oath of the governor of Maryland, ‘*I will not by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, molest any person professing to believe in Jesus Christ, for, or in respect of, religion.*’ Under the mild institutions and munificence of Baltimore, the dreary wilderness soon bloomed with the swarming life and activity of prosperous settlements; the Roman Catholics, who were oppressed by the laws of England, were sure to find a peaceful asylum in the quiet harbours of the Chesapeake; and there, too, *Protestants were sheltered from Protestant intolerance.*

“Such were the beautiful auspices under which the province of Maryland started into being; its prosperity and its peace seemed assured, the interest of its people and its proprietary were united, and for some years its internal peace and harmony were undisturbed. *Its history is the history of benevolence, gratitude and toleration.* No domestic factions disturbed its harmony. Everything breathed

peace but Clayborne. Dangers could only grow out of external causes, and were eventually the sad consequences of the revolution in England."

Which led, as we shall afterwards see, to the introduction of Protestant ascendancy and Protestant intolerance.

"Nor was it long before the inhabitants recognized Lord Baltimore's 'great charge and solicitude in maintaining the government, and protecting them in their persons, rights, and liberties;' and therefore, 'out of the desire to return some testimony of gratitude,' they freely granted 'such a subsidy as the young and poor estate of the colony could bear.' *Maryland, at that day, was unsurpassed for happiness and liberty. Conscience was without restraint; a mild and liberal proprietary conceded every measure which the welfare of the colony required; domestic union, a happy concert between all the branches of government, an increasing emigration, a productive commerce, a fertile soil, which Heaven had richly favoured with rivers and deep bays, united to perfect the scene of colonial felicity and contentment. Ever intent on advancing the interests of his colony, Lord Baltimore invited the Puritans of Massachusetts to emigrate to Maryland, offering them lands and privileges, and free liberty of religion,* but Gibbons, to whom he had forwarded a commission, was 'so wholly tutored in the New England discipline,' that he would not advance the wishes of the Irish peer; and the people, who subsequently refused Jamaica and Ireland, were not now tempted to desert the bay of Massachusetts for the Chesapeake."

But a change in this state of freedom and felicity was to ensue, and we shall now see beneath what influence religious toleration in Maryland succumbed.

"The controversy between the King and the Parliament advanced; the overthrow of the monarchy seemed about to confer unlimited power in England upon the embittered enemies of the Romish Church; and, as if with a foresight of impending danger, and an earnest desire to stay its approach, the Roman Catholics of Maryland, with the earnest concurrence of their governor and the proprietary, determined to place upon their statute book, an act for the religious freedom which had ever been sacred to their soil; 'And whereas the enforcing of the conscience in matters of religion,' such was the sublime tenor of a part of the statute, 'hath frequently fallen to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it has been practised, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutual love and amity among the inhabitants, no person within this province professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall be any ways troubled, molested, or discountenanced for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof.' "

“The design of the law of Maryland was undoubtedly to protect freedom of conscience; and, some years after it had been confirmed, the apologist of Lord Baltimore could assert that his government, in conformity with his strict and repeated injunctions, *had never given disturbance to any person in Maryland for matter of religion; that the colonists enjoyed freedom of conscience, not less than freedom of person and estate, as ample as any people in any place of the world. The disfranchised friends of prelacy from Massachusetts, and the Puritans from Virginia, were welcomed to equal liberty of conscience and political rights in the Roman Catholic province of Maryland.*”

“Well might the freemen of Maryland place upon their records a declaration of their gratitude, ‘as a memorial to all posterities,’ and a pledge that succeeding generations would faithfully remember ‘the care and industry of Lord Baltimore in advancing’ the peace and happiness of the colony.”

But how came this happy state of things to be changed? Our readers will soon have to learn that intolerance followed in the footsteps of revolution and Protestant ascendancy, or, as Bancroft expresses it, “The government which had been a government of benevolence, good order, and toleration, was by the force of circumstances soon abandoned to the misrule of bigotry and the anarchy of a disputed sovereignty.” After the fall of the sovereignty and the peerage in England, the claims of Lord Baltimore stood in the way of republicanism in Maryland. The parliamentary commissioners entered the province, and at first made a compromise or division of power with Stone, Lord Baltimore’s deputy. On the dissolution of the Long Parliament, Stone, considering the authority under which the commissioners acted to have expired, reinstated the previous state of things. The commissioners re-entered Maryland, compelled Stone to surrender his commission and the government into their hands, and appointed a board of ten commissioners, to whom the administration of Maryland was entrusted. The consequences of this change shall be stated in the language of Bancroft.

“Intolerance followed upon this arrangement, for parties had necessarily become identified with religious sects, and Maryland was a prize contended for. The Puritans, ever the friends of popular liberty, hostile to monarchy, and equally so to hereditary proprietary, contended earnestly for every civil liberty, but *had neither the gratitude to respect the rights of the government, by which they had been received and fostered, nor magnanimity to continue the toleration, to which*

alone they were indebted for their residence in the colony. A new assembly, convened at Patuxent, acknowledged the authority of Cromwell, but it also exasperated the whole Romish party by their wanton disfranchisement. An act concerning religion confirmed the freedom of conscience, provided the liberty were not extended to 'popery, prelacy, or licentiousness' of opinion."

We now trust that our readers, on reference to the third and fourth propositions, which in the introductory part of this article we undertook to maintain and establish, will be satisfied that we have fulfilled our pledge to the letter.

We proceed, therefore, to our fifth proposition, the further proof of which will be quite as full and distinct, and, like everything else we have ventured to assert, shall rest exclusively upon Protestant authority. We have already adverted to the persecution of Catholics in the settlement of Virginia, founded by Protestant Royalists and Episcopalians: having also witnessed the establishment of religious toleration by Catholics, and its extinction by Protestants, in Maryland, let us see what regulations on the same subject the Protestants introduced into New England, where they were the original settlers.

The circumstances attending the settlement of New England by the Pilgrim Fathers are more generally known, and it will not, therefore, be requisite for us to detail them at any length; we will rather refer to their conduct on the subject of religious toleration, and this, for the same reason as before, we prefer to do in the language of Mr. Bancroft. He prefaces his explanation of the circumstances which led to the passage of the Puritan exiles across the Atlantic, by some remarks upon the immediate consequences of the Reformation in England, from which we had made extracts, which want of space compels us to omit, and to which we would, therefore, refer our readers in the original.

The Puritans repudiated the religious authority of the church only to set up in lieu of it the religious tyranny of the multitude.

"How little," Bancroft in a note, p. 215, remarks, "the early Puritans knew of the true results of their doctrines, independence of the state in religious matters, is evident from such passages as these, from Cartwright's second reply, 'Heretics ought to be put to death nowe. If this be bloudie and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy Ghoste.' p. 115. 'I denie that upon

repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death.' p. 116. 'The magistrates which punish murder, and are loose in punishing the breaches of the first table, begynne at the wrong end,' p. 117, the writer continues, displaying intense and consistent bigotry."

No wonder, after such avowals, if we do not find much religious toleration among the Puritan settlers.

From England the Puritans first passed over to Holland, but being desirous of bringing themselves again into connection with their native land, they "petitioned the king for liberty of conscience," (a boon which they wanted for themselves, but would not concede to any one else,) and they obtained a patent, (which, however, was practically useless,) from the Virginia Company. On the 6th of September, 1620, the first Pilgrims, in all, men, women, and children, but one hundred souls, sailed from Plymouth in the celebrated Mayflower, a vessel of one hundred and eighty tons. As Bancroft observes,—

"The Pilgrims were Englishmen, Protestants, exiles for religion, men disciplined by misfortune, cultivated by opportunities of extensive observation, equal in rank as in rights, and bound by no code but that of religion or the public will."

These landed at Plymouth, others of their brethren who followed afterwards, landed at Charlestown, and the patent for the company of the Massachusetts Bay passed the seals, a few days only before Charles I., in a public state paper, avowed his design of governing without a parliament.

It was in the last days of June, 1629, that another little band of two hundred arrived at Salem, where the "corruptions of the English church" were never to be planted, and where a new reformation "was to be reduced to practice."

We are not, however, so much concerned with their local settlements as with the arrangements which they, "exiles for religion," having a perfect power of deciding as they chose respecting it, freely and *ex mero motu* determined to establish on the darling topic of liberty of conscience. It will be found that whilst they were most rigid in claiming and securing it for themselves, they rigidly denied it to Protestant episcopalians, and still more to the abominated Papists. They treated others exactly as they complained of being treated themselves,

and whilst they upon principle repudiated the authority of the Catholic Church and the Protestant Episcopacy, they exiled every one who in expounding the Scriptures did not follow the authority of their ministers and elders ; so that, in truth, that very idea of authority in matters of conscience and religion, which in one form they rejected and denounced, they established in another, and, we presume to think, a more objectionable form, and with a degree of exclusiveness hardly ever before paralleled in the history of religious intolerance. The Puritan exile, for conscience sake, banished every one who did not agree with himself in religion, instead of forming, after the pattern of the Catholics in Maryland, an asylum for the persecuted members of every religious creed. But the facts shall be related in the language of Bancroft, whose prepossessions are evidently all in favour of the Puritans, and who, therefore, in whatever he is obliged to relate against them is a perfectly unexceptionable witness. If it were not really lamentable, it would be almost amusing to read the terms in which Bancroft expresses the perfect assurance of the Puritans that they alone were right, and that all the rest of the world were wrong.

“ They regarded themselves as the ‘ chosen missionaries of God ;’ ‘ favourites with heaven ;’ ‘ and the depositaries of the purest truth,’ and the doctrine and discipline which they established at Salem, and which remained the rule of Puritan New England, were of a corresponding pattern.”

But some even here presumed to differ and protest. How did these Protestant dissenters deal with the children who thus imitated the example of their parents ? Bancroft shall tell us.

“ There existed, even in this little band, a few to whom the new system was unexpected, and in John and Samuel Browne they found able leaders. Both were members of the colonial council ; both were reputed ‘ sincere in their affection for the good of the plantation.’ They had been favourites for the corporation in England ; and one of them, an experienced lawyer, had been a member of the board of assistants in London. They refused to unite with the public assembly, and, resting on the authority of English law, and their rights under the charter, they gathered a company, in which Common ‘ Prayer worship’ was upheld. But should the emigrants—thus the colonists reasoned—give up the very purpose for which they had crossed the Atlantic ? Should the hierarchy

intrude on their devotions in the forests of Massachusetts? *They deemed the co-existence of their liberty and of prelacy impossible.* Anticipating invasions of their rights, they feared the adherents of the established church as spies in the camp; and *the form of religion from which they had suffered was therefore repelled*, not as a sect, but as a tyranny. 'You are separatists,' said the Brownes, in self-defence, 'and you will shortly be anabaptists.' 'We separate,' answered the ministers, 'not from the Church of England, but from its corruptions. We came away from the Common Prayer and ceremonies in our native land, where we suffered much for nonconformity; in this place of liberty we cannot, we will not, use them. Their imposition would be a sinful violation of the worship of God.' The governor, whose self-will was inflamed by fanaticism, and whose religious antipathies persecution had matured into hatred, the council and the people applauded; *the adherents of episcopacy were in their turn rebuked as separatists*; their plea was reprov'd as sedition, *their worship forbidden as a mutiny*; while the Brownes, who could not be terrified into silence, were seized like criminals, and in the returning ships were transported to England. *They were banished from Salem because they were churchmen.* Thus was episcopacy first professed in Massachusetts, and thus was it exiled. The blessings of the promised land were to be kept for Puritanic dissenters."

Let us, however, hear what Bancroft can say in vindication, almost in praise, of their conduct, and whilst reading his eulogy of the Puritans, let our Protestant readers at the same moment think what their sentiments would be if they heard such reasons advanced in behalf of persecuting Catholics.

"The emigrants were a body of sincere believers, desiring purity of religion, and not a colony of philosophers, bent upon universal toleration. Reverence for their faith led them to a new hemisphere, where distance might protect them from inquisition, to a soil of which they had purchased the exclusive possession, with a charter of which they had acquired the entire controul, for the sake of reducing to practice the doctrines of religion and the forms of civil liberty, which they cherished more than life itself.

"They constituted a corporation, to which they themselves might establish, at their pleasure, the terms of admission. They held in their own hands the key to their asylum, and *maintained their right of closing its doors against the enemies of its harmony and its safety.*"

"The select band of religious votaries were, by the fundamental law of the colony, constituted *the oracle of the divine will*," (in other words, an authority in matters of religion, the very thing which they pretended to denounce.) "Aristocracy was founded, but not

of wealth. The servant, the bondman, might be a member of the church, and therefore a freeman of the company. Other states have limited the possession of political rights to the opulent, to freeholders, to the firstborn; the Calvinists of Massachusetts, scrupulously refusing to the clergy the least shadow of political power, established the reign of the visible church—a commonwealth of the chosen people in covenant with God.”

In other words, the certainty of divine truth was determined by the votes of the people and universal suffrage, and everyone who otherwise exercised the right of private judgment was punished for not obeying the “oracle.”

“The controversy had required the arbitrament of the elders, for the rock on which the state rested was religion; a common faith had gathered, and still bound the people together. They were exclusive, for they had come to the outside of the world for the privilege of living by themselves. Fugitives from persecution, they shrank from contradiction as from the approach of peril. And why should they open their asylum to their oppressors? Religious union was made the bulwark of the exiles against expected attacks from the hierarchy of England. The wide continent of America invited colonization; they claimed their own narrow domains for ‘the brethren.’ Their religion was their life; they welcomed none but its adherents; *they could not tolerate the scoffer, the infidel, or the dissenter*; and the whole people met together in their congregations. Such was the system cherished as the stronghold of their freedom and their happiness.”

Roger Williams ventured to suggest “the sanctity of conscience,” whereupon

“The ministers got together and declared any one worthy of banishment who should obstinately assert that the civil magistrate might not intermeddle even to stop a church from apostacy and heresy.”

At page 337, Bancroft writes:

“Since a particular form of worship had become a part of the civil establishment, irreligion was now to be punished as a civil offence. The State was a model of Christ’s kingdom on earth; treason against the civil government was treason against Christ; and reciprocally, as the gospel had the right paramount, blasphemy, or what a jury should call blasphemy, was the highest offence in the catalogue of crimes. To deny any book of the Old or New Testament to be the written and infallible word of God, was punishable by fine or by stripes, and in case of obstinacy, by exile

or death. Absence from 'the ministry of the word' was punished by a fine."

It were tedious as well as needless to multiply quotations, suffice it to say that they did not only threaten, but actually inflicted the punishment of death for pertinacious difference from the established principles of Puritanism.

The partiality of Bancroft towards the Puritans is evident; though he cannot justify, he attempts to palliate their persecuting principles, by eulogizing the sincerity of their intentions. The same defence might probably be advanced in behalf of the Chinese, or any other exclusive body of pagans, who were conscientiously determined to keep their own globular mass of believers, totus teres atque rotundus, intact and inviolate from any Christian intrusion. It is impossible to lay down the principle of religious toleration, and at the same time to defend the conduct of the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. Their vital principle was utterly at variance with their bitter practice. The interior light, by which they deemed themselves guided to the true understanding of their favourite texts, could even they be insane enough to imagine that an equal irradiation of divine intelligence was denied to all the rest of mankind? Some, moreover, of their own elect body ventured to differ from the majority, as in the case of the Brownes and Williams, and the majority forthwith cast them forth. They established a religious democracy, and determined everything by the vote of the majority. This mere phrase seems to have had some charm to Bancroft, for surely there was little else to recommend it. Considered with reference to the rest of mankind, their whole body formed only a miserable minority, and if their rule was, inter se, sound for the decision of doctrine and practice, then was their whole community demonstrated to be wrong, by the very fact of their seceding from the majority of Christian believers. But it is idle to dwell longer on the inconsistencies and absurdities of men who scarcely propounded any one principle which they did not in practice oppose, whose creed and whose conduct were in antithesis instead of correspondence with each other, and whose separate existence on the principles which they maintained was a logical anomaly.

We have not in this paper attempted to define the mean-

ing, or to discuss the principle of religious toleration ; that would need a separate article, and for the present we would refer both our Catholic and Protestant readers to the 34th and 35th chapters of Balmez,* where they will find the question most rationally and lucidly treated. It would, we apprehend, puzzle most of the platform orators, who discourse so flippantly and loudly about religious liberty, to give any definition of what they mean by it, which would bear the test of general application. Let any one of them who doubts this make the attempt, and then, as a test of accuracy and consistency, say whether, in his opinion, it is lawful to punish for bigamy a Mormon, who conscientiously believes that the Sacred Scriptures authorize him to have two wives at the same time.

We have preferred to select a few passages from history illustrative of the actual conduct of Catholics, of Protestant Episcopalians, and of Protestant Dissenters, in the matter of religious toleration. We have not made a single statement upon any but Protestant authority ; the events and circumstances were such as placed the actors in a position for freedom of choice hardly to be paralleled in the world's history, and we trust we have satisfied our Protestant readers that, under such circumstances, there have been, and there are, Catholics who have adopted and practised religious toleration to an extent of which the records of Protestantism furnish no instance, whilst under similar circumstances we find Protestants expressly repudiating the principle of religious toleration, and, even when smarting from recent persecution, still inflicting like persecution upon others. Finally, we venture to repeat that we look in vain for any one instance in the history of Protestantism throughout the world, where upon *principle alone, and not as a measure of policy*, its professors have sincerely adopted and faithfully acted up to the rule of complete religious equality.

* Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their effects on the Civilization of Europe, by the Rev. J. Balmez.

ART. II.—*Poems.* By AUBREY DE VERE. Post 8vo. London : Burns and Lambert, 1855.

EVEN though Mr. De Vere appeared now for the first time as a poet, no one who has ever read a page of his prose could doubt his capacity for poetry, and for poetry of the very highest order. The best-known of his prose works, his "Picturesque Sketches in Greece and Turkey," although it never once outsteps the legitimate boundaries of prose, yet overflows with silent and unobtruded evidences of all the best characteristics of high poetical genius. There are few modern books of travel which display in higher activity that power which is the great source of the physical inspiration of the poet—the sensibility to natural beauty, at once quick and profound, through which the conceptive faculty draws all its best supplies of imagery; and still fewer which exhibit so beautifully that elevation of tone and instinctive appreciation of moral beauty, which alone imparts soul to the images derived from material things, and raises the sensuous creations of the poet beyond the region of sense. There were many passages in that admirable work which reminded us so forcibly of the only class of poetical composition to which good prose can ever bear a close resemblance—the solemn and stately Sonnet—that, even while we read them, we could almost fancy that we but had before us an unmetrical translation of some of the happiest and most classical of the truly classic sonnets of Schiller.

Nevertheless, neither this indication of high poetical powers, nor the unquestionable merit of many of the poems actually published by Mr. De Vere, had prepared us for such a volume as that which lies upon our table—for such rare and various beauty, such richness of imagination and profundity of thought, such a union of elegance and force, of terseness and luxuriance, of freshness and maturity.

Nor are these the sole, or, even in our eyes, the most remarkable characteristics of Mr. De Vere's poetry. By far the larger proportion of his present collection belongs to that metaphysical class which later writers, both in England and America, have made so popular, and which,

in the schools of modern poetry, holds the same position as the philosophy of Fichte in the field of mental science. He deals but little with the outer world. His speculations are essentially subjective—drawn from what Tennyson has called

The abysmal deeps of Personality.

Now we need scarcely say that through all the speculations of this school of poetry, as of its kindred school of philosophy, there runs a tone with which an humble catholic mind can have but few sympathies. The ideal of virtue which it supposes is utterly irreconcilable with the philosophy of the Cross. Pursued to its first principles, as Emerson, for example, has evolved them, it resolves itself, (if considered as a moral system at all,) into a subtle system of self-worship—a generous, humanly speaking, and ennobling worship, it is true—but yet a real self-worship—a practical deification of manhood. In the motives of action which it proposes every maxim of Christian morality is ignored, perhaps we should rather say, reversed. The humility of the Gospel is utterly unthought of. Its lessons of obedience and of love are kept entirely out of view. In their place are substituted either fierce and contemptuous defiance, like unhappy Shelley's; or vague aspirations after "the higher life," such as is dimly shadowed out in Longfellow's "Excelsior;" or hard lessons of self-reliance; empty warnings that

"Life is real! Life is earnest!"

and dreamy exhortations to follow the guidance of "the star of the unconquered will" to

Fear not, in a world like this,
And thou shalt know ere long,
Know *how sublime a thing it is*
To suffer, and be strong!

In a word, the whole teaching of this poetical morality is a direct appeal to human pride and human self-reliance; not merely as abstracting from reliance upon God, or on His grace, but even as contradistinguished from it, and as opposed to it. And although this may appear to some a matter of little practical importance; although many may be disposed to regard such lessons as these in the light of mere poet's dreams, utterly without moral significance or effective influence upon real life, yet we cannot bring our-

selves to share this feeling. It is perfectly true that there are many readers for whom they will be a matter of mere æsthetics ; but there are others for whom they will be of most serious and real import. We are but too well convinced that suggestions so flattering to the pride of man's heart cannot fail to find, in many instances, a ready acceptance and a hearty sympathy, especially from young and impressible minds. Nay, we believe that it is *all but impossible* for a youthful imagination, accustomed, even by mere poetical association, to place itself in habitual contact with such thoughts as these, to avoid contracting, almost insensibly, the spirit which they breathe ; learning to seek within himself every end of action, as well as every source of strength ; in a word, forgetting God altogether, and practically merging the childlike philosophy of the Cross in the stern and haughty prayer of the Strong Man.

O star of Strength ! I see thee stand,
And smile upon my pain !
Thou beckonest with thy mailed hand
And I am strong again !

And this, even more than our sense of his high poetical merit, is the source of our satisfaction in welcoming the appearance of such a poet as Mr. De Vere amongst us. We rejoice to see the influence of the popular and attractive school of poetry to which he belongs enlisted in the service of true christian philosophy. We rejoice to see a living example that it is possible to be profound and at the same time religious ; that it is possible to be hopeful and yet lowly-minded ; that it is possible, in fine, to look within man's heart and yet draw from it lessons of christian humility. And we trust it is in no spirit of idle triumph that we avow it as another, though a secondary source of our satisfaction, that, in numbering over those who, within the last eventful years of the history of our Church, have, under God's guidance, found a shelter within her bosom, we are able to point to such an example as this—

How much that Genius boasts as hers
And fancies hers alone,
On you, Meek Spirits, Faith confers !
—The proud have further gone
Perhaps, through life's deep maze—but you
Alone possess the labyrinth's clue !

Apart, however, from every such consideration as these, such a volume as Mr. De Vere's could hardly fail to command attention at any period. Although it consists exclusively of short and fugitive pieces, yet there is hardly one of them which does not exhibit the characteristics of genuine poetry. In many of the lighter poems we are reminded of the very best and happiest efforts of Tennyson. The more profoundly metaphysical, although directly opposite in their tendency and tone, bear a strong resemblance in conception and execution to those of Shelley, being marked by the same vigour and fertility of the conceptive faculty, the same truth and harmony in the use of imagery, the same rare copiousness and felicity of poetical vocabulary, and above all, the same strongly *subjective* character to which we have already alluded. It is a strange, and, alas! an humbling reflection that the same self-study—the same “question of th’ Infinity within”—which results in that blessed philosophy wherewith Mr. De Vere's poetry is instinct, has also led, under other lights and other guidance, to the withering conclusion, that

“Infinity within,
Infinity without, belie creation!
The exterminable spirit it contains
Is nature's only God!”

Would that every “self-student” could be animated by the sentiment which breathes through Mr. De Vere's beautiful lines,

“VIA INTELLIGENTIÆ!”

“O wash thine eyes with many a bitter tear;
And all things shall grow clear.
Bend that proud forehead nearer to the ground;
And catch a far foot's sound.
Say! wouldst thou know what faithful suppliants feel?
Thou, too, even thou, must kneel.
Do but thy part; and ask not why or how:
Religion is a Vow.
They sang not idle songs; pledges they made
For thee, an infant, laid
In the Church's lucid bosom. These must thou
Fulfil, or else renounce! Fulfil them *now*.
A Cross, and not a wreath was planted on thy brow.”

The great characteristic, indeed, of Mr. De Vere's poetry is *reality*—a quality which is discernible in all that

he has written. We do not know any writer who deals so largely with the ideal world, and yet moves with so firm a tread among its most unpalpable forms. We know no one so profuse in the use of imagery, whose images, at the same time, are so natural and so well sustained. His conceptive faculty is endowed with the rare power of realizing thoroughly to itself every object which it imagines. He seems to live among the creations of his fancy, however abstract, and to possess the power of bestowing upon them at will a distinct and clearly appreciable individuality. His most spiritual conceptions possess a personality as palpable to the mind as the hardest corporeal image to the eye or sense, and they all harmonize as consistently together as they are each true in themselves. In many of his poems there is a sort of hidden allegory, which nevertheless makes itself silently felt; and which, while it is perfectly intelligible, is even the more effective for the very dimness of the light in which it seems to be presented.

So again with the classical and historical allusions in which he delights, and in which his sonnets especially abound. Never far-fetched or unnatural—never introduced for themselves, or for the sake of their own beauty—they seem always the genuine and spontaneous fruit of a teeming memory, highly cultivated, and overflowing with its own abundance. We cannot recall a single illustration of this class, in the whole compass of his volume, which we could suppose to have been sought out, and not rather to have presented itself of its own accord, and grown naturally out of the working of a well-stored mind. His pathos, too, is the pathos of nature itself—a feeling, and not a sentiment, and one the presence of which is felt rather than described. Above all, the love of nature in all its forms of beauty, physical, intellectual, moral, is in Mr. De Vere's verse a genuine passion, inspiring every thought, giving force to every image and truth, and stamping reality upon every description. And when we add to this the singular richness and felicity of his vocabulary, his rare mastery over the very hardest and most unpliant forms of our language, and his peculiarly correct and truthful sense of rhythmical structure, we shall hardly, even still, have done justice to our own estimate of his high qualities as a poet.

These are qualities, too, which make themselves felt especially in Mr. De Vere's religious poetry. There is

something about it entirely different from all that characterizes the sacred poetry of the new school. In many of Longfellow's most beautiful poems—in his "Evangeline," and still more in his "Golden Legend"—there is a large infusion of religious poetry; and many scenes and incidents are described, of whose beauty and truth it would be most ungracious, on the part of a Catholic, not to render the most ample and unreserving acknowledgment. But it is impossible, even in the tenderest of them all, not to feel that the writer deals with them more as an artist than as a believer; that he admires rather than sympathizes; and that the guiding principle of his muse is rather æstheticism than religion. Beautiful as is Longfellow's conception of "Evangeline," instinct even as this conception is with spiritual as well as with natural beauty, it is impossible to read a poem like Mr. De Vere's "Queen Bertha," or his exquisite "Hymns for the Canonical Hours," without feeling how different would have been his conception of such a character as "Evangeline," and how infinitely more true to the inner catholic life.

It is time, however, to give the reader an opportunity of judging for himself of the poetry which we have attempted to describe. Among the longer poems which compose the volume are several ballads, which we would gladly transcribe, and especially the noble piece, "King Henry II. at the Tomb of King Arthur:" but, as they are for the most part too long to be inserted, and as their effect would be marred by being broken into fragments, we prefer to select a very powerful and touching piece, for us full of a painful interest, still fresh in the hearts of all who witnessed the melancholy scenes which form its subject. It is entitled "The Year of Sorrow"—the fatal year of famine and pestilence in Ireland, 1849.

"The Year of Sorrow" is represented in four stages, Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter. The first part opens with the picture of Spring in all her young beauty and luxuriance, and all the newness of her hope and promise,—sad contrast to the unhoping misery and gaunt despair of those to whose stricken hearts her promise brings no cheering influence.

"Who knows not Spring? Who doubts, when blows
Her breath, that Spring is come indeed?
The swallow doubts not; nor the rose
That stirs, but wakes not; nor the weed.

"I feel her near, but see her not ;
For these with pain uplifted eyes
Fall back repulsed ; and vapours blot
The vision of the earth and skies.

"I see her not—I feel her near,
As, charioted in mildest airs,
She sails through yon empyreal sphere,
And in her arms and bosom bears

"That urn of flowers and lustral dew
Whose sacred balm, o'er all things shed,
Revives the weak, the old renews,
And crowns with votive wreaths the dead.

"Once more the cuckoo's call I hear ;
I know, in many a glen profound,
The earliest violets of the year
Rise up like water from the ground.

"The thorn I know once more is white ;
And, far down many a forest dale,
The anemones in dubious light
Are trembling like a bridal veil.

"By streams released that singing flow
From craggy shelf, through sylvan glades,
The pale narcissus, well I know,
Smiles hour by hour on greener shades.

"The honeyed cowslip tufts once more
The golden slopes ;—with gradual ray
The primrose stars the rock, and o'er
The wood-path strews its milky way."

But where are they for whom this gorgeousness and
beauty are spread forth in vain ?

"From ruined huts and holes come forth
Old men, and look upon the sky !
The Power Divine is on the earth :
Give thanks to God before ye die !

"And ye, O children worn and weak,
Who care no more with flowers to play,
Lean on the grass your cold thin cheek,
And those slight hands, and whispering, say,

" ' Stern Mother of a race unblest,
In promise kindly, cold in deed ;—
Take back, O Earth, into thy breast,
The children whom thou wilt not feed.' "

The "Year of Sorrow" rolls on. Summer comes, and showers his bounty over the earth, over all its varied lands, save only one doomed spot.

"Impassioned stillness—fervours calm—
Brood, vast and bright, o'er land and deep :
The warrior sleeps beneath the palm ;
The dark-eyed captive guards his sleep.

"The Iberian labourer rests from toil ;
Sicilian virgins twine the dance ;
Laugh Tuscan vales in wine and oil :
Fresh laurels flash from brows of France.

"Far off, in regions of the North,
The hunter drops his winter fur ;
Sun-stricken babes their feet stretch forth ;
And nested dormice feebly stir.

"But thou, O land of many woes !
What cheer is thine ? Again the breath
Of proved Destruction o'er thee blows,
And sentenced fields grow black in death.

"In horror of a new despair
His blood-shot eyes the peasant strains,
With hands clenched fast, and lifted hair,
Along the daily darkening plains.

" ' Why trusted he to them his store ?
Why feared he not the scourge to come ?'
Fool ! turn the page of History o'er,—
The roll of Statutes—and be dumb !

"Behold, O People ! thou shalt die !
What art thou better than thy sires ?
The hunted deer a weeping eye
Turns on his birthplace, and expires."

We pass by "Autumn," with its long tale of wretchedness—of

"The widowed wife, the father fled,
The babe age-stricken from its birth—"

to come to the last sad "fytte" of this woful drama. We have seldom read a passage more thrilling in its tone, or more thoroughly poetical in its form, than the following.

"Fall, snow, and cease not! Flake by flake
The decent winding-sheet compose.
Thy task is just and pious; make
An end of blasphemies and woes.

"Fall flake by flake! by thee alone,
Last friend, the sleeping draught is given:
Kind nurse, by thee the couch is strewn—
The couch whose covering is from heaven.

"Descend and clasp the mountain's crest;
Inherit plain and valley deep:
This night, in thy maternal breast,
A vanquished nation dies in sleep.

"Lo! from the starry Temple gates
Death rides, and bears the flag of peace:
The combatants he separates;
He bids the wrath of ages cease.

"Descend, benignant Power! But O,
Ye torrents, shake no more the vale:
Dark streams, in silence seaward flow:
Thou rising storm, remit thy wail.

"Shake not to night, the cliffs of Moher,
Nor Brandon's base, rough sea! Thou Isle,
The Rite proceeds! From shore to shore,
Hold in thy gathered breath the while.

"Fall, snow! in stillness fall, like dew,
On temple's roof and cedar's fan;
And mould thyself on pine and yew;
And on the awful face of man."

One ray of comfort appears amid this universal desolation and gloom,—but even here the terrible interest is maintained.

"Without a sound, without a stir,
In streets and wolds, on rock on mound,
O omnipresent Comforter,
By thee, this night, the lost are found!

"On quaking moor, and mountain moss,
With eyes upstaring at the sky,
And arms extended like a cross,
The long-expectant sufferers lie.

“Bend o’er them, white robed Acolyte!
Put forth thine hand from cloud and mist,
And minister the last sad Rite,
Where altar there is none, nor priest.

“Touch thou the gates of soul and sense;
Touch darkening eyes and dying ears;
Touch stiffening hands and feet, and thence
Remove the trace of sin and tears.

“And ere thou seal those filmèd eyes,
Into God’s urn thy fingers dip,
And lay, ’mid eucharistic sighs,
The sacred wafer on the lip.

“This night the Absolver issues forth :
This night the Eternal Victim bleeds :
O winds and woods—O heaven and earth!
Be still this night. The Rite proceeds!

As a relief after the painful interest of this sad picture, we shall borrow a strophe or two from a very pretty Hymn “For the building of a Cottage,” which though in its form, an undisguised imitation of Schiller’s well-known “Song of the Bell,” is, nevertheless, perfectly original in all the details of its conception.

“Lay foundations deep and strong,
On the rock, and not the sand—
Morn her sacred beam has flung
O’er our ancient land.
And the children through the heather
Beaming joy from frank bright eyes
Dance along; and sing together
Their loud ecstasies.
Children, hallowed song to-day!
Sing, aloud; but, singing, pray.
Orphic measures, proudly swelling,
Lifted cities in old time :
Build me now a humbler dwelling
With a lowlier rhyme!
Unless God the work sustain,
Our toils are vain; and worse than vain.
Better to roam for aye, than rest
Under the impious shadow of a roof unblest!
“Mix the mortar o’er and o’er,
Holy music singing :

Holy water o'er it pour,
 Flowers and tresses flinging!
 Bless we now the earthen floor :
 May good Angels love it!
 Bless we now the new-raised door :
 And that cell above it!
 Holy cell, and holy shrine
 For the Maid and Child divine!
 Remember that thou see'st her bending
 O'er that babe upon her knee,
 All Heaven is ever thus extending
 Its arms of love round thee !
 Such thought thy step make light and gay
 As yon elastic linden spray
 On the smooth air nimbly dancing—
 Thy spirits like the dew glittering thereon and glancing!
 " Castles stern, in pride o'er-gazing
 Subject leagues of wolds and woods;
 Palace fronts their fretwork raising
 'Mid luxurious solitudes;
 These, through clouds their heads uplifting,
 The lightning challenge and invoke :
 His balance Power is ever shifting—
 The reed outlasts the oak.
 Live, thou cottage! live and flourish,
 Like a bank that spring showers nourish,
 Bright with field-flowers self-renewing,
 Annual violets, dateless clover—
 Eyes of flesh thy beauty viewing
 With a glance may pass it over;
 But to eyes that wiser are
 Thou glitterest like the morning star!
 O'er wise hearts thy beauty breathes
 Such sweets as morn shall waft from those new-planted
 wreaths!"

There is a deep and beautiful meaning in the closing verses.

"Kings of the earth ! too frail, too small
 This humble tenement for you?
 Then lo ! from Heaven my song shall call
 A statelier retinue!
 They come, the twilight ether cheering,
 (Not vain the suppliant song, not vain)
 Our earth on golden platform nearing :
 On us their crowns they rain!

Like gods they stand, the portal
Lighting with looks immortal!
Faith, on her chalice gazing deep :
And Justice with uplifted scale :
Meek Reverence; pure, undreaming Sleep :
Valour in diamond mail !
There Hope with vernal wreath : hard by
Indulgent Love; keen Purity;
And truth, with radiant forehead bare :
And Mirth, whose ringing laughter triumphs o'er Despair.

“ Breathe low—stand mute in reverent trance !
Those Potentates their mighty eyes
Have fixed. Right well that piercing glance
Roof, wall, and basement tries !
Foundations few that gaze can meet—
Therefore the Virtues stay with few :
But where they once have fixed their seat,
Her home Heaven fixes too !
They enter now, with awful grace,
Their dedicated dwelling place.
In tones majestic yet tender
They chant their consecration hymn,
From jewelled breasts a sacred splendour
Heaving through shadows dim.
The Rite is done : the seed is sown :
Leave, each his offering, and be gone !
Stay, ye for whom were raised these walls—
Possession God hath ta'en: and now His guests He calls.”

The lighter pieces in the collection exhibit in a different way the same highly poetical character: and it may truly be said that, in his gayest and most serious moods, the author has never lost sight of the best and purest models of the age. There are some of the few lyrical poems with which the volume is interspersed, which unite the depth and genuine feeling of Tennyson with the playful brilliancy of Thomas Moore; and we know few writers who have so uniformly maintained, through all the varieties of subject, the great characteristics of the genuine poetry of the affections—tenderness, delicacy, sensibility, and truth. “Pysche, or an Old Poet's Love;” “Lines written at Halsteads;” “Burns's Highland Mary;” and the charming little “Song,” at page 119; may take their place among the very best specimens of this class of poetry,

whether at home, or in the kindred school of Tieck, Uhland, and Rückert, in Germany.

We prefer, however, to follow him through what may be called his philosophical poetry. There are so many now-a-days by whom the process of versification is successfully cultivated ; the poetical vocabulary has grown so familiar ; the mechanical appliances of composition are so numerous and so easy of application ; and the entire *materiel* of the poetical art has been placed so completely within reach of every aspirant, that a degree of excellence in any of the ordinary departments, which thirty years since would have been sure to make the reputation of a life, will hardly suffice now-a-days to command the entrée of the poet's corner in one of our literary journals. If Mr. De Vere were judged solely by the pieces to which we have been referring, he would find many a rival among the "Poets of the Million" whom every new season ushers in. But it is very different as regards his "Poems on Sacred Subjects," his "Hymns," his "Sonnets," and especially the "Sonnets written in Travel." There is a stamp of originality upon them all which no art could counterfeit ; there is a vigour of conception and a depth of thought which no superficial drapery could imitate ; above all, there is an earnestness of purpose, an energy of will, a consciousness of truth and reality, which place them far beyond the artificial elegance of the poetical dangler, and the morbid sentimentality of the æsthetical amateur.

Who could mistake, for example, the practical purpose, any more than he could underrate the high poetical excellence, of these stanzas ?

MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

"Are these thy Prophets? England, speak !
Shall Strength be mastered by the weak ?

Shall we, in times gone by
For spiritual things who strove, submit
(By ease seduced or scared by wit)
To worship of a lie ?

"Woe to the land if this be so !
The heights infected, vales below
Will soon with plague be rife.
The philosophic sceptre rules,
Vicar of Faith—or foe—the schools
That rule the walks of life.

“ Pass then before us in review!
Rise, modern teachers! claim your due
Of honour, love, or fear.
First comes the chemist Locke, who taught
That minds in crucibles are wrought
Supplied through eye or ear.

“ The man who dreamed that fleshy seed
Those great creative thoughts could breed,
Which stamp us truly men.
Away! From God we come: with awe
From God those Truths ideal draw,
That mock the senses' ken.

“ Paley beside him takes his stand;
His pupil, graced with gown and band—
What scroll is that he rears?
Behold the Gospel, new-translated,
Of 'selfishness well-calculated:'
Well motivated hopes and fears!

“ From human hearts wouldst thou expel
The demons with a demon spell?
Sophist and Sadducee!
Thy work is vain: thy work is woe:—
Jesus they know and Paul they know;
But have not heard of thee.

“ Who next? A monk of modern cheer,
An economic sage draws near;
And, 'mid the fancied wreck
Of instincts old as earth, declares
'I'll make the planets move in squares
With my "preventive check!"'

“ Task easier than to tear apart,
For Mammon's service, heart from heart;
Those genial streams to freeze,
That cleanse our valleys and make sound,
Yet fertilize earth's utmost bound,—
The nuptial charities!

“ Of old monastic virtue left
Such bonds behind; and, thus bereft,
Brought forth the soul's increase.
The mountain plains of ice and stone
It ploughed; and reaped what God had sown:—
Below, the plains had peace!

“ Of old, where natural love had sway,
The chains were flax that barred its way:
Through deserts, and o'er floods

The warrior led a fearless bride;
And city towers were soon descried
O'er forest solitudes.

“Alas! with us had Faith been strong,
Or Nature's yearnings, not so long
Had we these shames endured!
Glassed in the church's font serene
Reason her god-like face had seen,
And seen it unobscured.

“Duty, erect, severe, and hard,
Had won her own sublime reward
Then most when seeking none.
On all the highways of our life,
Now mired with shame and dinned with strife,
The light of heaven had shone.

“No lawyer—faithful to his fee—
Had found in ‘average good’ a plea:
No statesman then had made
The ‘nation's wealth’ his first, great aim;
Nor to her greatness and her fame
Preferred her growth in trade.

“O ye who watch those springs cloud-girt
Of Thought, that soon their heights desert,
And sweep by field and town!
Keep pure your precious charge! Their breath
Can steep in dews of life or death
A nation's laurel crown!”

The same observations apply with still greater force to the noble “Fragments on Truth;” to the exquisite sonnet “On the Fall of Bacon;” to the lines on “Liberalism;” on “Law and Grace;” and most of all to “A Protestant's Musings at Rome.” The beauty of the last, indeed, is of the most various character, some of the scenes which are introduced into it being of the very highest order of descriptive poetry. No one who has ever been at Rome can fail to recognize, almost with a sense of gratitude to the poet who recalls so delightful a memory, the following magnificent picture of evening in the Eternal City.

“Hark that peal!
From countless domes that high in sunlight shake,
A thousand bells roll forth their harmonies.

The City, by the noontide flame oppressed,
And sheltered long in sleep, awakes. Even now
Along the Pincian steep, with youthful step
To dignity subdued, collegiate trains
Follow their grave preceptors. Courts grass-grown,
That echoed long some fountain's lonely splash,
Now ring more loudly, smitten by the steeds
Of prince, or prelate of the Church, intent,
On some majestic Rite. That peal again!
And now the link'd procession moves abroad,
Untwining slowly its voluminous folds.
It pauses—through the dusky archway drawn,
It vanishes—upcoiled at last, and still,
Girdling the Coliseum's central cross,
The sacred serpent rests. With stealthy motion
So slid the Esculapian snake of old
Forth from the darkness. In Hesperian isle
So rested, coiled around the mystic stem,
The watcher of the fruit. The day draws on.
The multitudinous thrill of quickening life
Vibrates through all the city, while its blood
Flows back from vein to vein. That sound prevails
In convent walks by rustling robe trailed o'er.
Like hum of insects unbeheld it throbs
Through orange-scented, cloistral gardens dim.
It deepens with the concourse onward borne
Between those statued Saints that guard thy bridge,
St. Angelo, and past the Adrian Tomb.
It swells within those colonnades whose arms
Receive once more the concourse from all lands—
The lofty English noble, student pale
From Germany, diplomatist from France,
Far Grecian patriarch, or Armenian priest,
Or Royal Exile. From thy marble roofs,
St. Peter's, in whose fastnesses abide,
Like Arab tribe encamped, the bands ordained
To guard them from the aggressive elements—
From those ærial roofs, to whispering depths
Of Crypts where kneels the cowed monk alone,
The murmur spreads, like one broad wind that lifts
Each morn the sighing shrouds of fleet becalmed.
The churches fill; the relics forth are brought:
Screened by rich fretwork the monastic apse
Resounds the hoarse chant, like an ocean cave:
And long ere yet those obelisks which once
Shadowed the Nile, o'er courts Basilican
Protrude their evening shades, like silver stars,
Before white altars glimmering, lights shall burn,

And solitary suppliants lift their hands
To Christ, for ever present, to His Saints,
And to His Martyrs, whom the Catacombs
Hid in their sunless bosoms."

Mr. De Vere is especially successful in that most difficult of all poetical compositions, the sonnet. His extraordinary mastery of the art of versification, and the evident command of all the forms of poetical diction which long familiarity with the best models has given him, have enabled him to overcome the traditional difficulties which beset this class of poetry, and which are indeed inseparable from the many rules and forms by which it is trammelled. No one, we imagine, in reading the "Sonnets written during Travel," could suppose, such is their freedom of language, and easy flow of thought, that the writer had been shackled in their composition by any law, or had followed any impulse beyond the flow of his own luxuriant imagination. The sonnets upon themes of classic interest are among the happiest we ever remember to have read. Many of them are such as one might suppose to have been penned by the author of "Childe Harold" in the hour of his highest and happiest inspiration. We cannot refrain from quoting one.

BIRDS IN THE BATHS OF DIOCLETIAN.

"Egerian warbler! unseen rhapsodist!
Whose carols antedate the Roman spring;
Who, while the old grey walls, thy playmates ring,
Dost evermore on one deep strain insist;
Flinging thy bell-notes through the sunset mist!
Touched by thy song rich weeds and wall-flowers swing
As in a breeze, the twilight crimsoning
That sucks from them aerial amethyst—
O for a Sibyl's insight to reveal
That lore thou sing'st of! Shall I guess it? nay!
Enough to hear thy strain—enough to feel
O'er all the extended soul the freshness steal
Of those ambrosial honeydews that weigh
Down with sweet force the azure lids of day."

We might say the same of the sonnets on "The Pillar of Trajan," on "The Arch of Titus," and still more of the magnificent lines on "The Campagna seen from St.

John Lateran.'” Of a different and far higher interest is the following.

A CONVENT SCHOOL IN A CORRUPT CITY.

“Hark how they laugh, those children at their sport !
O'er all this city vast that knows not sleep
Labour and Sin their ceaseless vigil keep :
Yet hither still good Angels make resort.
Innocence here and Mirth a single fort
Maintain : and though in many a snake-like sweep
Corruption round the weedy walls doth creep,
Its track not yet hath slimed this sunny court.
Glory to God, who so the world hath framed
That in all places children more abound
Than they by whom humanity is shamed.
Children outnumber men : and mil'ions die
(Who knows not this ?) in blameless infancy,
Sowing with innocence our sin-stained ground.

The image contained in the closing lines is most beautiful, and at the same time most true—just such a thought as we should expect to meet in that most wonderful of all revelations of the human heart—the “Confessions of St. Augustine,”—that strange union of the sublimest aspirations of philosophy, tempered and subdued by the lowly spirit of the cross.

Of the same character are the following beautiful lines on the striking and impressive ceremony, “The Washing of the Altar,” which is observed in Rome on the evening of Good Friday.

“Pour forth the wine-floods rich and dark,
Over the altar-stone :
The time is short ; the yew-trees, hark,
How mournfully they moan—
It is the sacred blood of Christ,
By angels poured o'er earth ;
While sable turns the amethyst,
And death to the new birth.

“O'er all the altar pour the wine,
With joyful strength amain ;
The streams alone from God's great vine
Can clear that altar's stain—

It is the Saviour's wondrous blood :—
The ensanguined planet now
Ascends from this baptismal flood,
As bright as Christ's own brow.

“ The flood that cleanses on and in
Roll, sacred brethren, roll ;
But Thou whose suffering purged our sin,
O wash each sinful soul—
It is the atoning blood of Him
By whom all worlds are shriven :
Who lights with love our midnight dim,
And changes earth to Heaven.”

We must make room for one more extract from the magnificent “ Hymn for the Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Rome.” It is one of those rare combinations of poetry and theology—a union of all the charm of a highly finished poem, with the terseness and vigour of a theological argument. It is, in fact, an exposition or a commentary upon the scriptural privileges and promises of the primacy of St. Peter—the Rock, the Keys, the Unfailing Faith, the charge, to “ Feed the lambs and Sheep,” the commission to maintain the unity of the household. Each of these is illustrated in succession with a beauty of imagery and a profundity of thought, for which we know no parallel in the whole range of English devotional poetry. We must content ourselves with the closing stanzas.

“ A thousand years passed by between
The earlier and the later storms
Ere yet, across the golden scene,
Rushed back old Error's myriad forms.
That Eastern hand, which raised again
Samaria's altar, withered soon ;
And on that altar bones of men
Were burned beneath the Arabian Moon.
But, in the West, o'er all the lands
The Rock cast far its sacred shade,
Till regions bare as desert sands
Grew green at last with wood and glade.
That Crown august, which, like a star,
O'er all things, and through all things shone,
Was regal, feudal, popular ;
Was friend to each, and slave to none.

—What power was that which, strong yet meek,
The equipoise of earth maintained,
Siding for ever with the weak?

That bound the haughty; freed the chained?
The Church of God—that Church which wound
Around the globe the Apostles' zone—
What clasped that zone; that girdle bound?
The Roman Unity alone."

* * * * *

"Who chains the Apostle? Chain who will,
He blesses those who chain him still!
Them that abhor him, them that fly,
Still, still he follows with his eye;
As some white peak o'er seaward streams
Casts glances far, and snowy gleams.
They that renounce thee beg thine alms:
They live but on thy grace benign;
Thine are their creeds, and thine their psalms:
Whate'er they have of Faith is thine.
Whate'er of Truth with them remains
Is theirs but in Tradition's right:
Their sheep, that die on welthier plains,
Are pastured on thy hills by night.
True Shepherd King! all powers beside
Are transient, and an empty show:
Around thee, like a shifting tide,
The world's great pageants ebb and flow.
True pilot of the Saviour's barque!
Who sails with thee is safe. The flood
But lifts more high thy sacred ark,
And floats it to the feet of God.
Thy God revealed His Son to thee:
Thy Maker called thee from above:
He chose thee from eternity:
He sealed thee with electing love.
—Thy Strength is Prayer. For them pray most,
With love matured in God's own beam,
Who make of liberty their boast,
Yet sell true freedom for a dream!"

"Prince of the Apostles! Like an hour
The years have passed since first that Word
Which signed thee with vicarial power
Beside that Syrian lake was heard.
O, strong since then, from heaven's far shore
Hold forth that Cross of old reversed;
O bind the world to Christ once more:
The chains of Satan touch and burst.

Strengthen the Apostolic Thrones :
 Make strong without, and pure within,
That Temple built with living stones,
 With planetary discipline.
Strengthen the thrones of Kings : the State
 Encompass with religious awe ;
Paternal rule corroborate :
 Impart new majesty to Law.
Strengthen the City, and the Orb
 Of Earth ; till each has reached its term.
Insurgent powers, and impious, curb ;
 The righteous and the just confirm."

But, in truth, there is hardly a page upon which we should not desire to linger ; nor can we terminate our extracts without congratulating our readers upon the acquisition of such a repertory of genuine Catholic poetry. We have already said that the pieces contained in the present collection are all short and of a fugitive character. But we know no writer of the present day so admirably qualified as the writer of these poems for the still higher task which it has been with us the dream—may we not now say the hope?—of years to see accomplished—a poem illustrative of the social and religious life of Mediæval Christendom—such a poem as Goethe's "Faust," or Longfellow's "Golden Legend,"—but conceived in a truly catholic tone, based upon a thorough knowledge of catholic principles and catholic usages, and, above all, not merely a perfect appreciation of the catholic spirit, but a complete and personal identification with it—a poem, in a word, conceived and written by one *within* the circle which it describes, not formed upon a few vague and imperfect glimpses obtained *from without*, and perhaps marred or distorted by the medium through which they had passed. Such a subject for Mr. De Vere would be a matter not of æstheticism but of religion, not a mere exercise of poetical taste, but a solemn office of duty and of love. This, however, is but a small part of his qualifications for the task. His various and extensive learning, his elegant tastes, his highly-cultivated imagination, his profoundly philosophical mind, and his evident familiarity with the religious philosophy of the mediæval schools, all mark him as eminently fitted to render the fullest justice to such a theme. What should we not give for such an ideal as he would be sure to sketch of the sublime yet practi-

cal intellect of St. Thomas, of the tender but solid mysticism of St. Bernard, of the homely but elevated spirituality of à Kempis! How different would be his "Margaret," or "Elsie," from the conceptions, all beautiful as they are, of Goethe or of Longfellow! Shall we not be permitted to hope for an early opportunity of making the comparison?

ART. III.—1. *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Richard Lalor Sheil.* By W. TORRENS McCULLAGH, Author of "The Industrial History of Free Nations," &c., &c. 2 vols. London: Colburn, 1855.

2. *Sketches Legal and Political.* By the late RIGHT HONOURABLE RICHARD LALOR SHEIL, edited, with Notes, by M. W. Savage, Esq. 2 vols. London: Colburn, 1855.

3. *Sketches of the Irish Bar; with other Literary and Political Essays.* By WILLIAM HENRY CURRAN, Esq., 2 vols. 8vo. London, Colburn, 1855.

WE are beginning to outgrow our history. Many of us find it difficult now-a-days to realize the condition of the unemancipated Irish Catholic. He would be a strange Irishman, nevertheless, who would not feel a deep interest in the history of one who played so distinguished a part in the successful assertion of Catholic claims as Richard Lalor Sheil. It is proper and salutary that we who have been born to the enjoyment of liberties for which our fathers had to struggle, should make ourselves acquainted with the nature and conditions of the contest; as one measure at least of the value of a result is the labour spent in its attainment. But there is another and perhaps a more important moral still to be gathered from the history of constitutional agitation in Ireland prior to 1829, and it is that which teaches us that the means employed in the vindication of our rights are most likely to prove effectual in their defence. It may be very well for a conqueror to secure and cement his conquests by clemency

and affability, but as long as the enemy keeps the field he must stand to his arms; and we should do ill to shut our eyes upon the state of public opinion in Great Britain, disclosing as it does a growing hostility to everything Catholic, more threatening in aspect, and more formidable in proportions from day to day. We are enabled to estimate the strength of that feeling by a test of sufficient power, and its intensity must be scarcely calculable when it shows under circumstances the most proper to discourage and repress it. The country is at this moment in close alliance with the greatest Catholic power; with a prince who but a few weeks ago had nearly expiated his protection of the Pope in a way that even Mr. Spooner will hardly approve; with a man whose life or death, a change in whose purpose, or the alienation of whose will, must effect the destinies of the empire in a degree we are scarce disposed to admit to ourselves; with a man, in fine, and a nation to whom we are bound by ties of gratitude as well as interest; and yet the present moment is chosen by the people of England, coarsely, officiously, and ostentatiously, to insult what Englishmen know by experience to be the most tender and sensitive of all susceptibilities, the religious feelings of their ally. The distemper must be very hopeless that can blind the great majority of Englishmen to the untimeliness and ungraciousness of the attack upon Maynooth, which is, after all, an experimental dealing and the preliminary to a bolder and more comprehensive scale of operations. The claims of Ireland in the matter, to consideration, or if that be too lofty a pretension, to forbearance; to the charities of Christianity, or the decencies of debate; are so little likely to have any influence whatever, that we have no desire to insist on them at all. She may well ask, "*Quæ utilitas in sanguine meo?*" and as far as the chance of mitigating Protestant rancour is concerned, we certainly do not see any. Foremost when the sands of India are to be slaked with our blood, or an enemy's flag to be brought down upon the sea; first and boldest in the struggle for reform; it is perhaps the condition of our place, as inevitable at Westminster as at Waterloo, that those who lead the charge should be trodden upon by those that follow them to victory; and hence it is, we suppose, that the very men whom we aided to enfranchise, whose chains we snapped while we were encumbered with our own, the dissenters of all others,

and the extreme professing liberals, have proved our bitterest and most uncompromising enemies. In apportioning the disasters of the present war, if the ratio of Protestant to Catholic in the population and in the service be considered, the blood of the offering will be found upon more Catholic door-posts than their just contribution to the wants of the country would require; but that will procure them no protection, no indemnity from the prevailing fanaticism; what a destroying angel might respect is contemned by a destroying fiend; the same thing may be good in the trenches and valueless in Parliament; it may preserve our dominion, but it cannot mollify our Spooners.

When such is the temper of protestant feeling, the study of our defences is surely natural, and not at all precipitate or premature. We are likely to have need of our best men and best counsels, and allowing for difference of position, for resources increased in some respects and diminished in others since our first political victories, we shall have to look into the past for principles of action, and the life of Sheil, for instance, is ready to our hand. It is needless to say we have no such men, amongst those at least who are in any degree of prominence, as the giants who obtained emancipation, for there were giants in those days. But, although they belonged to the heroic age of Irish politics, we cannot acknowledge ourselves so dwarfed and degenerate that we should be lost in their harness or unable to lift their weapons. They had their faults and were liable to mistakes, like the rest of us; yet who can doubt that theirs is the school in which to learn our art, and theirs the armoury in which to equip ourselves? The difficulties are, in some respects, greater than formerly, but as already observed, the same may be said of the advantages. We have not, as before, a great party in England, whose advocacy of our rights had for a long time past been traditional, and which gave us the benefit of its undivided co-operation in their attainment;—a party too, which included such men as Lord John Russell, Burdett, Denman, and Brougham, in the early maturity of their genius, and fresh impetuosity of their conviction. The first invasion of our rights, since they were supposed to be finally established, came precisely from that party; and it is to be feared, the support they lend us now is a pure matter of convenience, and hardly defended by them on the cold and

naked plea of expediency. On the other hand our enemies eager, resolute, and disciplined, although with different motives, and on principles widely diverse; some because they dislike us, and others because they long for place; some because they are simply wicked, others because they are only dishonest; and a large number, because on this point they are not altogether sane; club their private ends and particular enmities with an obstinate resolution to slight no advantage, however paltry; to improve every occasion, however insignificant; until they shall have reduced us to the level from which we rose so painfully, or possibly, till they have sunk us beneath it. Still, we have a good deal to rely upon. We have a vantage ground now that we had then to conquer; we had then to win our own, we have now only to hold it. We have also had, if we choose to profit by it, the benefit of experience; aided by a facility of organization, and a familiarity with its mechanism that practice alone can confer. We have, what is next in value to a knowledge of our own resources, and the way to use them, a tolerable knowledge of what the enemy can do, of his weak points and embarrassments, as well as of his strength and opportunities. It is plain to us he will fasten upon any pretence, however frivolous or unsubstantial; and it is equally plain that, if stripped of the pretence he will work without it. The peculiar circumstances of the time have placed him rather at a disadvantage, but unless we seize the opportunity to lay up strength for ourselves, to increase our own resources and diminish his—to perfect our discipline, and rally our friends; he will come upon us finally and irresistibly to the entire and lasting ruin of our liberties. Hence it is that the study of these early struggles becomes so necessary, and that we have need to encourage ourselves by the example and successes of the men who have achieved the portion of liberty we enjoy. Along with this we have the not less valuable study of their mistakes, on which we may be permitted to dwell without prejudice to the gratitude and regard we owe to their memory, and but for which mistakes we should not in all probability have to contend now in defence of those hardly-won rights which they bequeathed to us.

On all these grounds we welcome the *Memoirs of Richard Sheil* as a gift particularly appropriate to the time, and we have reason to feel indebted to Mr.

McCullagh for the way in which he has carried out his task. Indeed, we cannot see that he has left anything undone which belonged to the duty of a faithful and accurate biographer. There has been nothing omitted from the sayings and doings of Sheil which would not be absolutely too trivial for commemoration, and the volumes are quite sufficiently interspersed with extracts from his speeches and writings. Sheil's father, it appears, was one of the earliest that took advantage of the relaxation of the penal laws, which enabled Catholics to become owners in fee of land, and purchased the property where Sheil himself was born in 1791. It was fortunate for him that his lot was cast in times when the restriction upon Catholic education had been removed, and that he was enabled to follow his studies under the care of the English Jesuits long before the general reconstruction of the Society. Earlier still he had enjoyed the singular advantage unattainable to most British subjects at the period, of education in a French establishment; where, though the system of instruction, according to Sheil's own account, was exceedingly imperfect, he acquired a familiarity with the language and literature of France, in which Englishmen then were far more deficient than even at present. Pretty nearly all that is known of these school days Mr. McCullagh was obliged to copy from Sheil's recollections of the Jesuits, originally published in the "*New Monthly Magazine*," and since reprinted in the *Legal and Political Sketches*. They are written with the characteristic point and brilliancy of Sheil, and along with a few fantastic descriptions, contain a becoming tribute to the merits of the Society, disfigured rather by some of the common-place platitudes upon the subject, a concession perhaps to the taste of his public; perhaps a vague impression that he had never corrected by research. In addition to Sheil's own recollections we are assisted by those of Mr. Justice Ball, his schoolfellow, which the latter obligingly communicated to Mr. McCullagh, and which we in our turn place under contribution for a sketch of Sheil's appearance, which cannot but be faithful.

"His first appearance I recollect well,—it was strikingly grotesque. His face was pale and meagre; his limbs lank; his hair starting up from his head like a brush; a sort of muscular action

pervading his whole frame ; his dress foreign ; his talk broken English, and his voice a squeak. Add to this a pair of singularly brilliant eyes, lighting up all the peculiarities of his figure, and you have before you the boy Sheil. His performances were at first as singular as his person. His efforts to kick a football were *sui generis*. He never engaged in the game along with the other boys, but kept aloof, occupied in reading or walking about the playground ; but whenever the ball was thrown across his path he used to dart at it with frantic energy, his legs and arms all pretty nearly equally on the stretch, so that it was out of the question to determine with what limb he would assail the ball, until a kick at it probably from the left leg solved the problem : and then back he would go to his reading, amidst the yells of the urchins, enraged at his disturbing their game."—*Memoirs*, vol. I. p. 24.

In due course Sheil was entered a member of the Dublin University, and like most of his contemporaries, who were at all conscious of genius, or awake to ambition, took part in the debates of the Historical Society ; from which, though subjects connected with party politics were excluded by a stringent rule of the Board, it was impossible to shut out covert, yet transparent allusion to the exciting topics of the period. Sheil, it would appear, was remarkable rather than successful, but it was quite possible, even in such crude attempts as the occasion permitted, to see the bud and promise of his career. The utility of debating societies is a question on which the gravest and most respectable authorities are at issue, and we dare say it will long continue undecided whether they improve or deprave—whether they result in fluency as distinguished from glibness—whether they give you courage or only make you pert. In our own judgment they produce these several effects according to circumstances, but it is quite certain that most of our eminent men, the solid as well as the brilliant, have been, to some extent, formed in a debating society, or at least had their inclinations developed, and their choice of public life determined by its influence. For Sheil there were two arenas open, the bar and politics. He chose to play his part in both, and accordingly we find him speaking in one of the early meetings of the Catholic Committee on the question of a deputation to England from that body, to confer with the members of both Houses favourable to the Catholic claims. The short specimen of his oratory given by Mr. McCullagh is somewhat youthful in style and in

imagery, but what else could be expected from an undergraduate of twenty-one? It is not, however, deficient in character or body, and is by no means to be classed with that hollow and loose declamation so common amongst young men in their first attempts at speech-making.

Meanwhile reverses had overtaken his family, and they found themselves reduced from affluence to penury. It was only by the assistance of an uncle that he was enabled to keep his terms in Lincoln's Inn, yet his spirits suffered no depression, and he continued to take his part in the proceedings of the Catholic Board and to grow in public esteem, although the party with whom he sided in that body were rather low in public favour. The question of reserving to the government a negative upon the nomination of the Catholic bishops, popularly called the veto, or of giving it, in the cant of the time some similar guarantee, had often been mooted in connexion with the removal of Catholic disabilities, and was now distracting the counsels of the country. From the high catholic ground on which we are now beginning to establish ourselves, we must not look with too stern an eye upon the first struggles of the generation which has passed away. Sheil took part with the vetoists, who, it must be admitted, included in their number many sterling and conscientious men, just as the advocates of independence were many of them professing Catholics of strong convictions, but irregular practice. They did not perhaps take sufficiently into account the exceptional bigotry of Protestantism in these countries, which has only yielded to circumstances, not to conviction; and which, under favour of other circumstances, could be more cruel and more ingenious in its cruelty than that of Sweden or Denmark. They did not, perhaps, calculate upon the semi-Protestantism that would be required by Government in the candidates it might approve for vacant sees, nor yet the suspicion and alienation which the connection of the clergy with the state would generate amongst the people. Their error, whatever be the degree of blame attaching to it, was shared by Catholics of unquestioned orthodoxy and exemplary life; and Sheil at least expiated it by many a great and brilliant service.

He had scarcely been called to the bar when he attached himself to a pursuit of a far different description, and with very considerable success. Sheil was not what may be

called a great dramatist, but he was far above mediocrity, as managers, publishers, actors, and the public, sufficiently testified. We shall not follow him through this part of his career, the more especially as it has attracted its full share of notice from the general public, and our business is with a different aspect of his life. His first marriage, according to the approved precedent in such cases, followed hard upon his call to the bar, and notwithstanding his attention to tragedy and politics, he does not appear to have neglected his profession. Agitation and the drama, however, were still his chief though not exclusive occupation. About this time a difference of opinion between O'Connell and himself had nearly grown to a complete rupture, but after a temporary coolness their friendship revived, and continued ever after unimpaired though their paths in political life, afterwards diverged so widely. O'Connell was weary of the vile round of petitioning, and salaaming, and prostration, that had so long degraded the Catholics in their own esteem, and sunk them almost below the contempt of their tyrants. Sheil, on the other hand, though more fervid in oratory, was not so bold in enterprize, and though laborious and self-sacrificing in action, was perhaps a little timid in counsel. O'Connell was resolved not to pull off his shoes on the threshold of St. Stephens; if anything his tread was heavier, more clanging, and more defined as he approached it. To him it was not a temple to be entered with supplication, but a citadel to be carried by assault. The old Catholic board, so far as it could be said to exist, or the materials for such another after the lull in Catholic politics, he regarded as "a dish of skimmed milk," too sluggish to be stirred by so honourable an argument, and his brain was in travail of the association, in the working of which he was to find no so great, so friendly, or so worthy a fellow-labourer as Sheil. Meanwhile he proposed, in his annual letter of the 1st January, 1821, [and the sacrifice involved in such a proposal was heroic,] that Catholic emancipation as a specific object of attainment should be postponed, and reform taken up in its stead, so as to secure such a House of Commons as might be disposed not merely to entertain but to enforce the Catholic claims. Sheil opposed the proposal in a letter, not without a certain tenderness for O'Connell's feelings, but sufficiently severe withal, and not likely to be tenderly dealt with by O'Connell. After

a sharp reply from the latter, so sharp, indeed, that Sheil had some idea of making the matter a personal quarrel, the displeasure of both subsided, and we find them together at the same social board where the first rudimentary notions of the association were disclosed, and in the same committee-room where its memorable first meeting was held.

It was now that in conjunction with Mr. William Henry Curran, he began the series of *Legal and Political Sketches* in the "*New Monthly Magazine*," his contributions to which have been collected and edited by Mr. Savage. For a long time he had exclusive credit for their composition; and although those of his fellow-labourer were well worthy the reputation of Sheil, equally brilliant and humorous, and perhaps more acute and discriminating, we are glad to see the authorship asserted in a distinct publication by its rightful claimant, entitled as he is to all the respect and regard with which his father's name and his own virtues surround him. The Association for some time struggled with adverse influences, with apathy in Ireland, and contempt elsewhere, but it advanced gradually, and every day improved its position, so that when numbers came at length, and the garrison was at its full strength, the defences were all ready, and it only remained to man them. Sheil was most effectual in the recruiting service—for matchless in its way as was the oratory of O'Connell, it could not compare in perfection, in brilliancy, in finish, with that of Sheil. Many who had been drawn to the meetings from pure curiosity, were unable to resist the spell of his regulated enthusiasm, and became the fervent apostles of the movement. We select a specimen from one of his speeches, because it is different in style and matter from those which have been most before the public, and bears upon the subject which we should wish to see the one absorbing study of the Irish people, as indispensable not to its happiness but to its existence.

"Frequent allusions occur in the proceedings of the Association to the vast wealth of the Establishment, and to the supercilious bearing which characterised too often the upper grades of the hierarchy. The following may be taken as a specimen of the serious raillery which the anti-national spirit of the Anglican Church in Ireland at that time provoked:—

" ' Let me suppose that the spirit of Plato were submitted to some necromantic process of resuscitation, and that after he had revisited

glimpses of the moon, the task of effecting his posthumous conversion to Christianity were committed to the pious divine whose meek and apostolic forehead has been recently invested with the archiepiscopal mitre of the metropolis. Let me be permitted to imagine that the ex-fellow of the university of Dublin were to revert to those early occupations from which his sacred prosperity is derived, that he were entrusted with the religious education of the reanimated philosopher, and that, having again become tutor, he should have Plato for his pupil. I pass by the preliminaries of introduction, between those distinguished personages, and say nothing of the astonishment of Plato, at the episcopal jauntiness of air, and the volatile agility of demeanour which characterizes the learned doctor. Let me imagine the wonder of Plato to have subsided at the novelty of this our modern world, in which the doctor performs so important a part, and that having been contented upon the other subject of his admiration, he exclaimed, 'Where are the gods of the old time? What has become of Jupiter? Does the thunder no longer roll at his behest? What has befallen the martial maid to whom Athens had devoted her peculiar adoration? Where is the sublime worship of the god of poetry and light? Has he been flung, like his own adventurous boy, from the chariot of the sun?' To this interrogatory the doctor replies, 'These graceful but unholy products of the idolatrous imagination of your country have returned into the nothingness from which they rose. These dreams of fabulous creed have passed away, and that of which you or your master, Socrates, in one of your noblest dialogues, have given a prophetic intimation, has been realized, in a pure and celestial system of worship and of faith. There came from heaven a being whose precepts carry an internal evidence of their divinity, and who, to use your own words of remote prediction, 'have taught us to pray.' His coming was not announced in thunder, nor was His mission illustrated with flashes of lightning. His arrival on the earth was told in the solitude of the night, in a peaceful and lonely song to two 'shepherds abiding on the mountains.' He descended as an emissary of that Godhead of which He was at once a messenger and an emanation, in the lowliest form with which miserable humanity could be invested. His whole life was as simple as His birth was obscure. The poor, the sorrowful, and the unfortunate were his companions. His only pomp consisted in the grandeur of His revelations, and even their sublimity was tempered by the meekness of His moral inculcations. Mercy dwelt for ever on His lips, and diffused His attributes over all His actions. Humility was deified in His person. It was from the throne of shame and suffering that He proclaimed Himself a monarch, and His last act of moral sovereignty was the pathetic cry of forgiveness, at the remembrance of which the infidel of Geneva could not refrain from lapsing into an involuntary credulity, and exclaiming in the spirit of the soldier who attended his agony, that if the death of

Socrates was the death of a saint, the death of Jesus was that of God. His disciples participated in the divine character of their preceptor, and the twelve inspired teachers of His eternal Word, propagated His doctrines with the humility of Him from whom they had received them. The spirit of their religion was typified by the meekness of a dove. They went forth with naked feet, and with scarce enough of raiment to shield them from the inclemency of the air. They spent their lives in fasting and the prayer which they prescribed; they taught mankind that there was a sanctity in suffering, and a blessedness in tears; that life was a brief and miserable transition to that heaven towards which their eyes were for ever turned; and that the kingdom of Jesus was not of this world. Such were the first propagators of that sublime religion in which I have undertaken to give you instructions. I am one of the anointed representatives of those inspired but meek and patient men, and in me you behold a successor of the apostles.'—'You!' Plato would exclaim; and I leave you to conjecture the expression of surprise that would needs invest the features of the philosopher in the utterance of the monosyllabic ejaculation of astonishment. The doctor [let us suppose] proceeds to give the Gospel to Plato, who peruses the holy writing, and afterwards returns to his preceptor in humility. 'I have read,' he may be imagined to say, 'I have read the wonderful book which you have placed in my hands, and I confess that all the volumes of philosophy vanish before it, it is impressed with the seal of inspiration, and its pages are the records of heaven. In my own visions of perfection I never reached even in conjecture to a point of moral sublimity which could be compared with the incalculable elevation of this supreme system of goodness, of mercy, and of love, but, Doctor, forgive me for asking you whether you participate in that high conviction which it is your profession to impart?' 'I!' cries the Doctor, 'what a question to the Author of the Atonement!' 'I hear, indeed,' the philosopher might reply, 'that you yourself made an atonement but without a sacrifice. You have expiated certain deviations into liberality into which you wandered before your advancement to the glittering top from which you superintend and overlook the religion of Jesus. Doctor, I must be candid with you. Of course I cannot controvert the truth of your assertions, but I own I never should have taken you to be a successor of the humble philosophers of Palestine. You remind me more of some of the spruce acrimonious disputants called sophists, who used of old to infest the groves of the academy. You tell me that the mildness of your Master was expressed by the softness of the dove; your own spirit would find its emblem in the proud predatory falcon. You are a preceptor of forgiveness, while your pen distils virulence in every word; your lips that should breathe nothing but mercy, are smeared with the poison of polemics. You leave venom in your very kiss of peace. Even your pastoral injunctions, which should be the effusions of

tenderness and piety, overflow with bitterness and gall. You have sent an arrow in the shape of a barbed antithesis, to rankle in the heart of your country. You and your brother pontiffs talk of poverty, while the yearly income you derive from the public would, at the rate of Athenian exchange, amount to several talents. You speak of humility while you tread on the tip-toe of importance, and haughtiness sits mitred on your brow. You prescribe the ascetic regimen of self-denial while you quaff the richest nectar out of silver and gold. You are lapped in down while you bid your followers make their couch of frozen earth. You are ever canopied with purple, while you tell them that the Christian should have no roof but the cope of heaven above his head. From the banquet of Dives you hold up Lazarus to imitation. Your palaces outvie the temples of the fallen Gods, and you have substituted yourselves for the idols you deride.'"—Vol. i. pp. 200-203.

The association was now becoming in the hands of its leaders an engine of government. It took cognizance of injustice, social as well as political and religious. It had an exchequer perpetually full or cheerfully replenished. It levied taxes, it arbitrated disputes, it wielded the whole strength of the country, although all its power had not yet been put forth. The fears of the Protestant interest became alarmed, and were ingenious to discover new grounds of resistance to concession. The phantom of Catholic ascendancy and redistribution of confiscated property was summoned up, and to allay these apprehensions, a deputation to England was proposed about the close of 1824. "We must try," said Sheil, "to convince the people of England that we are worthy of being incorporated in the great and free community of British citizenship, and that its value and durability would in nowise be diminished by being shared. Liberty is like light, and is not impaired by participation. The English are a wise, a generous, a lofty-minded people; we should appeal to their wisdom, their justice, and their generosity. Our emancipation would be an act of thrift as well as of humanity, it would be an act of economy as well as of honour to make us free. * * * Things cannot stand as they are. Either a great national reconciliation must be effected, or hostility must be deepened, reciprocal antipathies must be strengthened, new force and activity must be communicated to the popular passions, and if the fountain of bitterness is not sealed it must receive a fresh supply. Are we to be everlastingly arrayed and marshalled against each other by the infuriat-

ing provocations of the law?" It is with great regret we pass by the well-selected passages from Sheil's speeches, with which the volumes are sufficiently but not inconveniently full. Mr. McCullagh does no more than justice to Sheil when he notices the wonderful variety of his illustrations, and the absence of repetition where the subject was invariable. It can only be accounted for by the fact that the subject, though invariable, was inexhaustible, while the progress of the association, under one or other of its forms, was so rapid, and the development so ample, that the spirit of its leaders rose with the occasion, and made them capable of efforts that under other circumstances must have been impossible. O'Connell and Sheil were prosecuted successively, but the prosecution failed in one instance and was abandoned in the other. The Duke of York, then so near the throne, bound himself by oath in public, never to give his sanction or assent to the removal of Catholic disabilities, and he was met by Sheil with a declaration as stern and as sacramental. "We are willing," he said, "to bind ourselves to the prosecution of this great cause by the most solemn adjurations that can bind us to God or man, and if heaven is to be invoked by princes for our degradation, let us offer up a counter invocation, let us band ourselves to our country by a bond as holy as a prince's word, and swear that we shall at last be free by the dignity of human nature, so help us God." The association was suppressed by act of parliament, and it was reconstituted in all its efficiency under a form that completely took it out of the operation of the statute. The struggle began to attract the notice of France and America, and an element of agitation hitherto unknown was brought into play—the unlimited influence of the clergy over their people,—a people whom events have proved to be as manageable under discipline as they are daring and self-sacrificing under any circumstances. Another function of government was assumed by the association—a census of the Catholics was recommended and as promptly carried out. There was no loitering, no hesitation; no one thought of half-counsels or half-measures, and victory was the result, as it would be again if the men of these times would condescend to resemble O'Connell and Sheil.

The association now began to take part in the elections, and here it was that its entire power was put forth. The voters were at the absolute mercy of their masters, who

could annihilate them as effectually by an "habere" as if they had still the right of "haute et basse justice." Yet at the risk of being turned adrift upon the world, without bread or shelter, those heroic men, at the bidding of the Association, immolated themselves and their families to country and religion, unfalteringly, promptly, and unreservedly.

Sheil's celebrated speech in reference to the health of the Duke of York, which had been given in a complimentary strain by a Catholic baronet, at a Catholic dinner, is to our mind one of the most honest, most genuine, and consequently most eloquent effusions of Sheil's heart and genius. That such a sentiment should have been given on an occasion like that which assembled the company was a miracle of bathos, it was (if the expression be not too Irish) the sublime of grovelling, and Sheil rebuked it in a way that did him more honour than his quasi retractation, or perhaps we might rather call it "amende," after the death of the royal Duke. We pass over a good many stirring incidents and remarkable speeches to make room for an extract which gives us the impression made by his oratory upon a French gentleman, with whom the public in these countries is sufficient familiar.

"About this time the Duc de Montebello, accompanied by M.M. Duvergier d'Hauranne and Thayer, visited Ireland, and in a work subsequently published, an interesting account was given of the impressions made upon their minds by the strange and anomalous condition of things they beheld. They were present at the provincial meeting for Connaught, held at Ballinasloe, the account of which, as given by M. Duvergier, is eminently piquant and picturesque. While one of the speakers was inveighing against the bad faith of the government in past times towards the Catholics, and the infatuation of driving them to look to the revolt in America as an example, a loud and prolonged cheer burst forth suddenly from every quarter, which shook the edifice to its roof. It was the unlooked for appearance of Mr. Sheil on the platform that had produced this startling effect.

" 'Were I commissioned,' writes M. Duvergier, 'to take down the *signaliment* of Mr. Shiel, this would be very nearly the result : four feet four ; eyes quick and piercing ; complexion pale ; chin pointed ; hair dark ; and, adding mouth middle sized, I flatter myself I should have given a description not to be excelled in exactness at the *Bureau des passeports*. But this is the portrait of the *gentleman* ; that of the *orator* is widely diverse. When you behold that little Gascon figure in repose, it is impossible to suspect to what changes

passion is capable of converting it. There is in Sheil something of Juvenal, of Pindar, and of Mirabeau. His satire is shrewd and biting, his poetry dazzles, his enthusiasm carries you away. When he flings forth his sarcasm a bitter smile contracts his lips ; when he threatens his eyes dart forth lightnings ; when he is under the dominion of powerful inspiration, they take an expression altogether sublime. His voice is meagre, harsh, and shrill ; but a profound emotion seems to regulate its vibrations. His gesture is quick, abrupt, and rather disorderly ; but it is always in perfect accord with such sentiments as he has to express. Sheil possesses in an eminent degree the surprising facility of exciting himself to the very verge of delirium without once losing his complete self-possession. I was at his side while speaking, and more than once I saw all his limbs tremble. A moment after he pursued the discussion with not less composure than ingenuity. Like the English, whom in other particulars he so little resembles, Sheil is too fond of quotations. Certain passages in bad taste, it may also be observed, occasionally disfigure the best of his speeches, and in general it has been remarked, that in both elocution and diction there is something too much of the theatre about him. These reproaches have some appearance of being well founded, as more than once, indeed I imagined I had the figure of Kean actually before me, but then I must also add, that Kean is a very admirable actor. In a word, I was seduced—I was dazzled, and together with me the whole assembly. During an entire hour, one single soul, that of the orator, seemed to animate the living mass ; and from time to time you would have said that one electric shock completely convulsed them. I never before assisted at so absolute a triumph.”—Vol. i. pp. 309—311.

Thus went on the agitation from triumph to triumph—not merely oratorical triumphs, but successes, the result of perfect organization, and still more, of perfect resolution. It was no longer a question of appeal, of petition, or conciliation ; for the people had calculated the cost, and whether the object were worth attainment or not, was determined upon compassing it, and at all hazards and oppose who might. We shall not ask to give a sketch of the Clare election, which has always been regarded as the turning point in the agitation, as the grand stroke and crowning success. The country is already familiar with its principal features, and what we require most to study, the organization and the details, it would be impossible to enter into here. He took a great and effective part in the election, and his vehement advocacy was perhaps decisive of the adoption of the project. Never was he more worthy

of himself than in his speeches during that momentous contest which gave expression to the fixed and irrevocable resolution of Ireland to emancipate herself. His pictures of the strength of the association, of the determination of its leaders, of the unanimity of the people, of their readiness to accept reasonable concesssion, and their power to extort terms; were at once so truthful, so energetic, and yet so moderate, that their effect must have been, as it was, exceeding great. At length, the object of all its secondary victories was achieved, and Catholics were admitted, or rather had forced their way to the naked right of citizenship, though most of its privileges were still withheld. It was, on the whole, a great and solid victory, gloriously and decisively won, even if at a cost with which, in the opinion of many, the advantages were hardly commensurate. That is not precisely our own opinion. The disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders was undoubtedly a heavy price for the enfranchisement of county gentlemen and barristers, if the question were to be argued, as between the many and the few; between those on whose side was all the loss, and those who in a certain sense monopolized the profit of emancipation. Under any circumstances the price was extravagant, and yet, not to be refused if inevitable. It deprived emancipation of half its value, but the remaining half was still a splendid prize; for it involved, as was supposed, the final triumph of religious liberty in these countries. Sheil's ideas of the immediate benefits to be derived from that great measure were very moderate, to say the least. They do not seem to include what were supposed to be the object of his own ambition, but he was sufficiently discerning to see that a suitable endowment of Maynooth was one of the conditions most indispensable to the permanent amelioration of Ireland.

“ We have given little more than a few outlines; the mere general view, or as the French say, the *aperçu* of this most important question. We cannot, within the compass to which an article of this kind must necessarily be confined, enter into minute details, yet, before we leave the topic of education, we cannot refrain from adverting to what has always appeared to us to be the most deserving of the attention, both of the legislature and the government—we mean the larger endowment and augmentation of the funds of Maynooth College.

“ They are at present miserably insufficient even for the pur-

poses which are proposed, and they would be utterly inadequate to the greater and now national ends of which this college might be made the instrument. When Mr. Canning was in Ireland he visited Maynooth *incognito*, and was disgusted with the necessities to which he found that poverty had reduced both the professors and the students, in what ought to be a great national seminary. But, considering the poor pittance which is given for the education of such a vast body as the priesthood of seven millions, it is rather wonderful that so much has been accomplished, than surprising that little has been effected. Take the priests of Ireland, and on the average they will be found to possess information quite beyond their comparative means of acquiring it, and their manner, although deficient perhaps in the gracefulness and merits which a Jesuit would exhibit, are seldom or never rude, and even when they are so, are not intended to be offensive.

“When, therefore, Maynooth has done so much, it should be an inducement to the government to turn it to still larger and more useful account, and by elevating the source from which clerical instructions is derived, to give it in its progress through the country a deeper and a wider current. Why should not a Catholic college with nearly all the honours and advantages of a university be established? If it be admitted that the priesthood are a most important and influential body, and that upon them the improvement of Ireland is mainly dependant, it is quite obvious that the nursery of that priesthood is deserving of the most solicitous care.

“It is then, at Maynooth that the great business of national reformation should commence. Let its professorships be endowed; let the chairs of the College be the reward of great talent and erudition, which independance will unquestionably stimulate; let the course of studies be lengthened, and instead of merely catching up enough of Latin, to go through the diurnal process of reading the breviary; let the students be made as much masters of the classical languages and the works of which they are the medium, as the scholars of foreign universities; let science be cultivated, let eloquence be studied, and the principles of good taste fixed on the mind; and above all let a deep persuasion, founded upon the evidence of the facts brought home to their own doors be established, that the government of these countries, instead of giving to the Church of the people a cold and equivocal support, which rather blighted than sheltered it, are unaffectedly anxious to shelter and sustain it, and upon noble and extended branches to make it bear valuable fruit.

“While we give this recommendation, we are far from saying that the University of Dublin is to be despoiled in order to enrich its younger sister. Let their portions be both independent of each other, and let the establishment most directly connected with the state be the more favoured of the two. No Roman Catholic will begrudge the wealth of the university, where it must be owned, that as far as the students are concerned, there is no invidious distinction between

Catholics and Protestants maintained. But the preference to be still given to Dublin College is perfectly compatible with a large extension of favour to the institution, which has hitherto been treated as a mere step child and allowed to starve for want of a sufficient aliment for its natural and wholesome sustenance.

“The advocates of the Established Church in Ireland, and especially Lord Plunket, have repeatedly insisted that the distribution of a number of well educated persons through the country, who were bound by their profession to maintain a decency and regularity of conduct, so far from being injurious to the community, was accompanied by signal advantages, and tended to counteract the evils of Squirearchy in Ireland. They have expatiated on the good results of the system of residentship, which the recent enforcement of it amongst churchmen was likely to produce, and have plausibly contended that the want of a local gentry was supplied in a great measure by the members of the Established Religion, who, in the great majority of instances spent most of their time in their cures.

“I am not prepared to controvert the justice, to a certain extent, of these observations, but if it be true that a body of enlightened gentlemen, with moderate incomes, whose manner and deportment afford incentives to civilization, are calculated to be useful though they should be the ministers of a religion which is not only not that of the people but which has been the object of their antipathy, how much larger would be the advantage which would accrue from the location in every district of a well-educated, refined and intelligent clergyman, with literary tendencies, and accomplished manners, unattended by the domestic solitudes which are incidental to the connubial condition of the Protestant clergy, and placed in a happy and virtuous mean between indigence and luxury, with leisure and inclination to cultivate his own mind and to improve the habits of those who should be committed to his charge. The creation of such a clergy in Ireland, for which there exist admirable materials, would beyond all doubt work a great national improvement, and the first measure to be adopted for the effectuation of the end is the larger endowment of Maynooth. It appears to be strangely incongruous that the sum of £25,000 should be annually granted to the Kildare Street Society for the purposes of education, and that no more than £9,828 should be granted for the academical institution of that most influential body which might be easily rendered the moral police of Ireland.”—*Sketches Legal and Political.* Vol. ii. 240-244.

There is but little in Sheil's history after 1829, to which, as Catholics, we can turn with pleasure; there is much in the published remains of his writings which we sincerely deplore. Many of the sentiments and views embodied in the “*Sketches*,” are of a character which we cannot but

unequivocally condemn. His conduct, too, in the memorable crisis of the Durham Letter, did more to strengthen the hands of the assailants of Catholic liberties, than the open and active subserviency with which other members of our body welcomed the brand of inferiority with which it was sought to visit us. It must be confessed, indeed, in sadness, that his religious sympathies were of the weakest and the most vague. He never rose beyond the ideas in which his youth had been nurtured, and his conception of Catholic liberty did not extend beyond the mere negative idea of emancipation from the political chains which had been the bugbear of his early imagination.

We have preferred, therefore, to dwell chiefly on his political career; and even here we would gladly have consented to close the book at the page which records the achievement of the triumph to which his youthful energies had been devoted.

We have advisedly given, therefore, to the earlier half of his career what, under ordinary circumstances, would be an undue consideration; for his parliamentary life, if in our judgment not quite equal to his reputation earned upon other fields, was in the opinion of many, and, indeed, of the world in general, entirely upon a level with it. To a certain extent the eminence he reached in parliament is, and of right ought to be, a greater source of pride to his admirers than any of his previous successes; as owing to the character of his audience, and the school of eloquence to which he belonged, the task was of so arduous a nature. That, however, is a question purely personal, and perhaps, in a literary point of view, his parliamentary eloquence may be less open to criticism than much that he had said when his genius was more vigorous though less mature, and his judgment more adventurous though less correct; but neither was his life subsequent to 1829 at all devoid of interest or barren of events. The curious episode of 1834, when he was charged with political profligacy, which if brought home must have been fatal to his character and prospects, but of which he was acquitted by a committee of the house, unquestionably independent; the dramatic incidents to which the affair gave rise; and the demeanour of Sheil on an occasion so trying and so pregnant with result to his destiny; are well and graphically brought out by Mr. McCullagh. His frequent encounters with Mr. Stanley, and his well-remembered reply to Lord Lynd-

hurst, when that noble person was so indiscreetly candid as to taunt the Irish people in terms with an alienage which, as everyone knew, he and his party were determined to perpetuate in substance; are also well worthy of record and study. We could, for many reasons, wish to dwell upon his defence of O'Connell in the state trials of '44. We remember to have heard him for the first and only time, at a Catholic meeting in Abbey Street, convened to protest against the jury trick of the period, where the rank of the jugglers, and a less degree of cleverness, was all that distinguished them from their road-side brethren that turn an honest penny by their pea and thimble. His words were few but electrical. He was keeping himself in reserve for the effort in court. Even he had little conception how dry a formality was his protest against jury packing in Ireland. A great judge once said that he would deal with an action on a bill of exchange as he would with a trial for murder; but in Ireland, if our civil litigation was arbitrated on the principles of our criminal justice, where religion or politics are in question; it is doubtful would there exist a bill of exchange on which to bring an action. The English in general may well reverence the law. For them she realizes the Grecian conception of wisdom, an armed virgin, chaste as fair, and wise as chaste, but in Ireland she has too often been as she was then, a scarlet hussy, the slave and the disgrace of every faction in its hour. He little foresaw that his own friends, who in '44 were the loudest and most virtuous protesters against jury packing, would in '49 manipulate the lists themselves, and deal out from the treasury benches, with a glibness more peculiarly official, the cast-off slang of their predecessors. It matters not that the charges were proven against the unfortunate visionaries who had to pay the penalty, when it was equally notorious that they were condemned not because they were guilty, but because they were accused; and that a verdict of regicide or deicide would have come as little amiss to the juries as the verdict of high treason.

Towards the close of Sheil's life, and from the time of his promotion to the Mastership of the Mint, the interest of the history somewhat languishes. The man is completely or almost completely lost in the Minister, and the Minister himself seems lost in his workshop. There are still some touches of feeling in the few speeches belonging

to that period which recal his old self. Nothing can be more genuine or more affectionate than his public tribute to the memory of O'Connell, but it was only in conformity with that generous and uniform recognition of O'Connell's greatness which is one of the noblest features of Sheil's character. We have passed over all these things lightly, not that we take a cold interest in them, but because the time requires something more stern than sentiment, and more practical than fine writing. We must have rules of action not canons of criticism, and it is for the former we have looked most anxiously in the life of Sheil. Not that we care to particularize what is chiefly to be commended or imitated in his career. Our pretension is not to instruct the country, but we would most earnestly implore of the country to instruct itself. In reviewing the conduct of its servants when they have been called away from their labours, a nation has infallible instincts of approval and censure, which we do not presume either to interpret or to lead. It is very far from our intention to approve indiscriminately of Sheil's political course. The country has not unfrequently expressed its ideas on the matter without much reserve, though at the present moment the sentiment most prevalent is, we believe, as it ought to be, one of gratitude and affectionate remembrance, a feeling certainly not diminished by the labours of Mr. McCullagh and Mr. Savage. But it is for us Catholics as we have already said to look for lessons in the terms of which those volumes are a record. The organs of Catholic opinion, jealous and divided as they are, concur nevertheless in the expression of their belief, that the suppression of Maynooth is valuable in the eyes of its promoters only as preliminary to other and more fundamental changes. The leaders of adverse opinion are equally unequivocal and unanimous in the declaration of their object, and their determination to secure it. But beyond the testimony of friendly or hostile opinion, is that undefined yet positive and universal impression on the public mind that religious liberty is threatened. The very quietude of the enemy in some points is ominous. Circumstances so remarkable as the fact that all the law officers of the Crown are Catholics—that if we take the average of calls to the Irish bar for the last four terms, Catholics have been to Protestants in the proportion of about four to one—that the under secretary for the colonies is a Romanist,

and clerk of the ordnance an apostate—all these have been passed over without anything like the noisy condemnation that a far more limited patronage of Catholics would have provoked a few years ago, when the turbulence of fanaticism betrayed the smallness of its strength and the shallowness of its designs. That is not so now—it has designs deep and well matured.—It has learned by experience the inutility of nibbling at details, though it can see advantages in attacks where none are apparent to us, and if it forbear to lop the boughs, it is because it has laid the axe to the root. Is any one simple enough to imagine that Maynooth is the primary and ultimate object of the assault, or that, if it fall, its ruins will not form a new parallel for the reduction of the last retreat of religious freedom? It is to be hoped that no such simplicity exists amongst us, for if it prevailed to any extent our prospects would be melancholy indeed. Penetrated with this feeling, we have drawn less largely than perhaps might have been desirable on the admirable sketches which Sheil has given us of the legal and political celebrities of his time. We had little inclination for dilettante reading or literary gossip. If we mean to hold our liberties we have work before us—rough work perhaps, nay, *not* perhaps, but most assuredly, and it is time we should train ourselves for what we have to do. How often have we heard, and how often has it not occurred to ourselves—If O’Connell were alive, we and our assailants would exchange positions. And why should we not do so now that O’Connell is no more? Because we are wanting to ourselves, and whereas we have the history of the struggles which he led, and the successes he achieved to animate and guide us, to quicken our ambition, to inflame our zeal, to inspire our courage, we, notwithstanding, content ourselves with divided and desultory resistance, a worse thing and more ridiculous than passive submission. As a specimen of the truth, the ruth, the good faith, the chastity of honour, the sanctity of oaths, and the inviolability of compacts, on which we may have to rely if we place ourselves at the mercy of our enemies, we make our final extract from the Legal and Political Sketches. We should lay it well to heart.

“Upon Tuesday the 22nd of February, 1703, Sir Theobald Butler appeared at the Bar, and with the treaty of Limerick in his

hand requested on behalf of the Irish Roman Catholics to be heard. It must have been a very remarkable scene. Whether we consider the assembly to whom the demonstration was addressed, or the body on whose behalf it was spoken, whose leading nobles, and they were then numerous, stood beside their advocate at the bar of the house, we cannot but feel our minds impressed with a vivid image of a most imposing and, in some particulars, a very moving spectacle. The first advocate of his time, who was himself a principal party in the cause which he came to plead, stood before a Protestant House of Commons, while below the bar about their counsel stood the heads of the Roman Catholic Aristocracy. The latter constituted a more extensive and differently constituted class of men from those by whom they have been succeeded. They had been born to wealth and honour; they had been induced by a sentiment of chivalrous devotion to attach themselves to the fortunes of an unhappy prince. The source of their calamities was in a lofty sentiment; almost all of them had been soldiers, scarce a man of them but had carried harness on his back. They were actuated by the high and gallant spirit which belongs to the profession of arms. On the banks of the Boyne, on the hill of Aughrim, at the gates of Limerick they had given evidences of valour which, though unavailing, was not the less heroic. They had been worsted, indeed, but they had not been subdued. They had been accustomed to consider their liberties as secured by a great compact, and in substituting the honour of England for the bastions of Limerick, they looked upon their liberties as protected by still more irresistible muumuments.

“It is easy to imagine the dismay, the indignation and the anguish, with which these gentlemen must have seen a statute in rapid progress through the legislature, which would not only have the effect of violating the treaty of Limerick and reduce them to a state of utter servitude, but by holding out the estate of the father as a premium for the apostacy of the child, would inculcate a revolt against the first instincts of nature and the most sacred ordinances of God. Their advocate, at least, saw the penal code in this light. ‘Is not this,’ he exclaimed, ‘against the laws of God and man, against the rules of reason and justice,—is not this the most effectual way in the world to make children undutiful and to bring the grey hairs of the parent to the grave with grief and tears?’ In speaking thus, he did no more than give vent to the feelings which, being himself a father, he must have experienced; and the heart of every parent whose cause he was pleading must have been roused by their utterance.

“If there was something imposing in the sight of so many of the old catholic nobility of Ireland, of so many soldiers gathered round their counsel in a group of venerable figures (for most of them who had fought in the civil wars were now old;) the assembly to which they had come to offer their remonstrance must have also presented

a very striking spectacle. The Irish House of Commons represented a victorious and triumphant community. Pride, haughtiness and disdain, the arrogance of conquest, the appetite of unsatisfied revenge, the consciousness of masterdom and the determination to employ it, must have given this fierce and despotic convention a very marked character. Most of its members, as well as of Roman Catholic suppliants had been soldiers, and to the gloom of Puritanism, to which they were still prone, they united a martial and overbearing sternness, and exhibited the flush of victory on their haughty and commanding aspect.

“To this day there are some traces of lugubrious peculiarity in the descendants of the Cromwellian settlers in Ireland. At the period of which we speak, the children of the pious adventurers must have exhibited still deeper gloom of visage, and a darker severity of brow. In addressing an assembly so constituted, and before which an ordinary man would have quailed, Sir Theobald had to perform a high and arduous duty. He must have felt when advancing to the bar of the house, he threw his eyes around him and beheld the lurid looks and baleful countenances of the Protestant conquerors of his country, and saw beside him the companions of his youth, the associates of his early life, many of them his own kindred, all of them his fellow-sufferers, clinging to him as their only stay, and substituting his talents for the arms which he had persuaded them to lay down. The men whom he had seen working the cannon at the batteries of Limerick stood now, with no other safeguard than his eloquence, at the mercy of those whom they had fought in the breach and encountered on the field. An orator of antiquity mentions that he never rose to speak upon an important occasion without a tremor. When the advocate of a whole people rose in the deep hush of expectation and in all that thrilling silence which awaits the first words of a great public speaker, how must his heart have throbbed!

“Sir Theobald Butler’s speech” (we dwell thus long upon it, because the event which produced it has been attended with such important consequences, and the arguments of the Roman Catholic barrister have excited a good deal of parliamentary notice) “comprehends almost every reason that can be advanced against the enactment of the penal code as a violation of the public faith. He did not however confine himself to mere reasoning upon the subject, but made an attempt to touch the feelings of his Protestant auditors. He has drawn a strong and simple picture of the domestic effects of the penal code in the families of Roman Catholics by transferring the estate of the father to the renegade son! That the law should invest any man with the power of depriving his fellow subject of his property would be a grievance. But my son, my child, the fruit of my body, whom I have nursed in my bosom and loved more dearly than any life—to become my plunderer, to take away my bread, to deprive me of my estate, to

cut my throat—it is enough to make the most flinty heart bleed to think of it—‘For God’s sake, gentlemen, make the case your own’—* * * surely in the utterance of this appeal, not by a mere mercenary artificer of passion, but by a man whom everybody knew to be speaking the truth, and whose trembling hands and quivering accents must have borne attestation to his emotion, the sternest and most resolved of his judges must have relented, and like the evil spirit at the contemplation of all the misery he was about to inflict—

For the time remained
Of enmity disarmed.

And if the hearts of the Protestant confiscators were touched did not the tears roll down the faces of the unfortunate Catholics who stood by? Did they not turn to sob in the bosom of their children, and clasping them in their arms enquire, in the dumb eloquence of that parental embrace, ‘whether they would ever strike the poniard with which the law was about to arm them into their breasts?’ Their advocate did not appeal merely to the sensibilities of his auditors, but swept his hand over strings by which a still deeper vibration must have been produced.

“He assumed a loftier and bolder tone. He raised himself up to the full height of his mind, and, appealing to the principles of eternal truth and justice, denounced the vengeance of heaven on those who should be so basely perfidious as to violate a great and sacred compact, and was sufficiently courageous to remind a Protestant House of Commons that the treaty of Limerick had been signed ‘when the Catholics had arms in their hands.’ This was a stirring sentence, and sent many a heart-thrilling recollection into the hearts of those to whom it was addressed.—The prince of the conquerors must have started, and the conquered must have looked into hands in which there were swords no more. * * * I do not think I am guilty of any exaggeration when I say that in appealing to the time when the Catholics had arms in their hands, the advocate of their rights and the representative of their emotions must have brought back many a marked recollection to the clients in whose front he stood and in whose cause he was so emphatically pleading. The city, from which William at its first siege, with an army of thirty-thousand men, had been driven back, the fortress which nature and art had conspired to make strong, and which valour and constancy would have rendered impregnable, must have risen before them. All the glorious circumstances incidental to their former occupation must have returned. The shout of battle, the roar of the cannon, the bloody fosse, the assault and the repulse. The devotion and abandonment with which whole regiments rushed through the gates and precipitated themselves into martyrdom. Sarsfield upon the battlements, the green flag

floating from the citadel, and the cry of 'Help from France ;' these must have been among the recollections which were awakened by their advocate when he appealed to the time 'when they had arms in their hands' and stood in the fire of their batteries and not at the threshold of the House of Commons.

"But if the sentiment of martial pride was rekindled for an instant how soon it must have gone out, and how soon their emotions must have collapsed into despair. They must have known (for the countenances of the victors must have apprised them) that they had nothing to expect but servitude and all the shame that follows it ; and then, indeed, they must have mourned over the day when, at the head of a powerful army, in a strong fortification, with several of the garrison towns still in their possession, with the mass of the population ready to rush again to the field, and with a French fleet freighted with arms and troops in the Shannon, they had been induced on the faith of a solemn compact to lay down their arms and put their trust in the honour of a king and the integrity of his people. They must have cursed the day when, instead of adding their bones to the remains of those who lay slaughtered in the trenches of Limerick, they survived to behold the Protestants of Ireland taking advantage of that fatal surrender, and in defiance of the most solemn compacts, in violation of a clear and most indisputable treaty, not only excluding them from the honours and privileges of the State, but wresting their property from their hands, instituting a legalized banditti of discoverers, exciting their children into an insurrection against human nature, converting filial ingratitude into a merit, and setting up parricide as a newly invented virtue in the infernal ethics of the law.

"As Sir Theobald Butler had anticipated [for he intimates it in an involuntary expression of despondency] his arguments were of little avail, and he lived long enough to see this penal code carried to its atrocious perfection, and chain after chain thrown upon his country."—*Sketches*, vol. i. pp. 125-134.

It is with the solemnity of a deep conviction, verging on the melancholy of as deep a foreboding, that we say there are millions of our fellow subjects as pitiless, as remorseless, as inaccessible to reason, as obdurate to prayer as the parliament that heard those words and passed that law. In the obscurest walks of our own professional toil (for like the subject of our Memoir, the tradition of Butler has been committed to us, though unworthy) we see that righteous Nemesis, the encumbered estates commission, drive its ploughshare through the boundaries of ill-gotten estates, turning up at every step memorials of that impious statute, against which Butler invoked the name of God, the faith of treaties, and the bowels of humanity in vain ; as in vain

perhaps he would invoke the same to-day before a similar assembly in another place. Assuredly, it is not wise for Mr. Napier, when he sanctions meetings where they tell us our religion was fabricated in hell, to put us upon bringing to mind the introduction of his own. He must be ashamed of it himself. The child of irregular love is made to blush when his parents are but named, and the right-minded Protestant in Ireland must blush at the origin of his establishment. In Scotland, the Reformation as a movement was hearty, popular, and almost universal. In England, if we scruple to allow the Protestant Establishment the title of a National Church, we cannot deny it the proportions, and magnificent ones, too, of a national apostacy. It has been tried, if not purified by adversity and persecution; and what is most important, politically speaking, it has its reason of existence in belonging to an entire people. But here, the offspring of violence, it still lives by rapine; the hymn of its nativity was pealed in every sound of human woe; its progress might be traced, not in the blood of the evangelizers, but of the evangelized; its gospel devoted our heads to destruction; and if the destruction has been stayed, to God alone be the glory, for our apostles did their worst. Ask individual Protestants how their ancestors came to profess the reformed religion, and you may learn from one how his father took the sacrament in the college chapel and a scholarship in the college theatre at short intervals. Another will tell you, his progenitor, in the undoubted exercise of private judgment, interpreted literally, the text of Scripture that exhorts you to hate your father for God's sake, and by recanting his errors antedated his succession—a large class would inform you that the Protestant founders of their houses belonged to no family in particular, and were converted to the pure reformed faith whatever that be in the foundling hospital: while the ancestors of all not included in these categories established themselves in a way less disgraceful, but not more evangelical. They were sincere Protestants who owed their land to their convictions and not their convictions to their land, they dispossessed the original owners less by process of law than process of arms, and availed themselves largely, as their descendants would to-day, of the missionary labours of dragoons and hangmen. These in their turn have given way to missionaries of a different stamp, to men who establish corner houses of spiritual

infamy ; who lie in wait to crimp unwary souls, and to assail the virtue of the hungry with bread ; who always begin conversion by corruption, season manna with onions, and think they have secured a valuable auxiliary when they take the devil into the pay of the Almighty. It certainly is not our fault if these things are put forward thus broadly for the first time after a lapse of more than a quarter of a century, and even now if a word has escaped us offensive to any variety of Protestants, *as a religious body*, we can only say it was perfectly unintentional. If Mr. Spooner and Mr. Chambers on the other side of the Channel, and Mr. Napier with Mr. Whiteside on this, have determined to precipitate a crisis, the blame be on their heads. Before Emancipation and since, we have had Catholic meetings of all complexions and dimensions, from the knot of idlers in a chapel yard to the million and a half at Tara. Some have been professedly catholic, others political in purpose but catholic in constitution ; and we think it can be said on the part of the country, that, neither in placard nor in speech, though both may have been inflammatory and ill-advised, was there uttered deliberately, or at all, a single insulting phrase, a solitary denunciation or a random sneer against the confessional peculiarities of Protestants. On the other hand we could no more calculate the amount of filth that has been showered upon us daily, that is to say upon our faith and doctrine, even as apart from ourselves, than we could investigate off-hand any of those problems so interesting to newspaper statist, such as the area which the national debt would cover in penny-pieces. Not content with the injury and dishonour which attach to the bare presence of the Establishment amongst us, the patrons of that institution assail our most sacred mysteries in language that to say the least of it can serve no other purpose than that of exasperation. As to the Rotunda oratory we shall only say that it is almost too rank for the digestion of Exeter Hall. The placards that flare upon the walls, the hand-bills that are fluttered in our faces, the advertisements that figure between the miracles of Holloway and the poetry of Hyam, exhausting the varieties of indecency to create new varieties of insult, cannot but have some effect. It will not be to no purpose that Mr. Justice Crampton thinks it becoming to patronize Gavazzi, Mr. Napier to associate with Fleury, and Mr. Disraeli to

acknowledge Gregg. Whatever may come of the intolerant temper of England, we ought not to regret the attitude assumed by Irish Protestantism on the question of Maynooth and every other ; it should not give us pain to hear the treble pipe of Irish malignity above the surly roar of English bigotry. The thing is not without its significancy and its use, for on the one hand it bespeaks the dotage and foretokens the downfall of a tyranny the most crooked and decrepit that exists, while on the other, it shews us that the only way to redress the mendacious grievances of the establishment in Ireland is to finish with its audacious existence. Its proceedings are strongly suggestive of the throwing down the coat, that form of challenge now happily obsolete, but once not unfamiliar to the citizens of every Irish town. The coat in question has already suffered in the service, and it would have been no superfluous tenderness to spare it the treatment such a defiance is likely to provoke, for we are greatly mistaken and shall be greatly disappointed if the Irish nation do not accept the challenge and trample down the coat till they stain it with the variation of every soil on every highway on the Island. Again, upon the evidence quoted, may we not appeal to England and Ireland, to angels and to men, whether the Church establishment is to be endured amongst us longer ? Anti-national, it is a loathing to the people whose name it usurps ; anti-social, it alone is every day killing amongst us the charities of life ; anti-christian, it effaces in us all the distinctive marks set by the Redeemer on His followers, that of loving one another. It is not easy to speak with temper upon such a subject, but the contempt in which every Irishman must hold himself for having endured so long the presence of the Establishment ought to forbid any feeling of his to reach the dignity of indignation. There it stands, mocking at us from behind the skirts of the Queen, whose name it dishonours, thrusting forth its impudent forehead and lolling out its obscene tongue before the insulted country. It is not less insatiable or thankless in its greed or more full for feasting now than it was three-hundred years ago. Our substance is drawn off for its luxury not for its nourishment, the blood it circulated was always tainted and meat serves only to pamper its distempers. Certainly, a tenderness less resolute than that of its nursing fathers would have abandoned the infirm nursling long ago, but they appear to have

acted on the excellent advice of Horace, to regard the natural defects or moral vices of one's friend as amiable weaknesses, and qualify them with terms of endearment. They looked upon the rickets of their infant Church as pretty helplessness, and for them she snuffed with a grace peculiarly her own; when she cried for the moon she was appeased with substantial acres of the earth; when her cravings were too irregular, ingenuity was tortured to amuse their extravagance; she clamoured for a peculiar mutilation of our priests, and a penal law scarcely less stimulating with difficulty found acceptance; if she swallow Maynooth she has stomach for Emancipation.

It is well for us who can afford to be merry upon such a subject, but, merry or sad, we must put the question to ourselves, are we to remain for centuries longer in presence with a corporation, the inheritrix of such traditions, and the child of such a nurture? Can the same island contain the Catholic nation and the Protestant Establishment, or have we strength enough to say to that institution as Philip of Macedon said to the Olynthians, either you or we must quit? If we say this, *and mean it*, the worst part of the alternative will not fall to the nation. We must first set it before ourselves, and then it will be apparent to others that we will not allow the present state of things to last; [*allow* must be the word,]—that our Protestant countrymen have as good a right to their country and to room for their Church in it as we, but that the clerical infamy known as the Establishment we will no longer tolerate. It is ignoble to stand on the defensive, but it is bad strategy besides. Nothing is more wearisome, more trying to the energies, or more exhausting to the spirits, than constant resistance. If we are satisfied with such a system—*ville assiégée ville prise*—Maynooth will fall first, as the most exposed outwork—our liberties will be taken in detail—and a very few years will see us utterly vanquished by the sheer tedium of resistance, and the conquests of O'Connell and Sheil a memory and a myth. To illustrate the fatuity of such a course we have a comparison at hand that ought to come home to the English mind, as being at once classical and national. “The policy of those,” says Demosthenes, “who do not take proper measures for attack differs in nothing from a barbarian's style of pugilism. The barbarian, instead of meeting his antagonist with a careful fence and planting vigorous touches of offence when occa-

sion offers, no sooner feels a blow than he claps his hand on the bruise until he is roused by another application of the glove to repeat the manœuvre in another spot.”—Surely we cannot afford to do this—if we hold back or stumble now we are lost. A few years ago, the Establishment fleshed its fasting tooth in the titles of Irish bishops, though no one alleged they had offended in the matter, and now, like an animal of savage nature, having once tasted blood it becomes irreclaimable.—Its jealousy was then aroused by a papal rescript—at present Maynooth is the national sin,—next day, by the sequence of an inevitable logic, the national guilt will be transferred to our mumming ceremonies—cut them down, and the impiety of our Mariolatry will draw judgment upon the land—but how horrible the prevarication to permit the public exercise of a worship which the sovereign solemnly swears to be damnable and idolatrous. This is what the Establishment will effect if we give it the advantage by our supineness, but if we grapple with it the danger is infinitely diminished. It has no real strength, because its power is from without, whereas “all the glory of the king’s daughter is from within.” Whether scoffing like Satan in his pride, or hissing like Satan in his humiliation, whether it strut a swaggering Briareus with a hundred hands, or crawl an angry insect upon a hundred legs—it is weak withal, for the giant is stuffed and you may set your foot upon the insect.—No doubt endurance is sometimes less grievous than resistance, and to suffer more profitable than to strive—but here we are quiescent at our peril—the object of the enemy is at least avowed—there is to be no peace with Rome until devotion to Mary is forgotten like the worship of Astarte, and a Catholic as unusual a phenomenon as a Gheber,—they strike the shepherds that the sheep may be dispersed, and they will not forbear till the country is thoroughly purified from that kind of animal *ὅπως ἡ χώρα του τοιουτου ζώου καθαρά γένηται το παρπαν*. And we eat and drink and are glad, and we marry and give in marriage, while this is being carried out around us, amongst us, and by us, for inaction when action may avail is equivalent to co-operation. Resignation to other grievances is often advisable and occasionally virtuous, but this one of the Establishment being even more a dishonour than a wrong, to endure it patiently is not longanimity but cretinism, and when we

take into account the active and effective hostility of the Establishment to our dearest interests, spiritual and civil, the stupidity of our own endurance is the most startling anomaly where everything is anomalous.

All this is known to the fanatics in England, and they can hardly be wrong in supposing that a nation which is passive under such a wrong will submit to any other. They know as well as we that in the diocese of London alone there are more Protestants of the Established confession than in all Ireland. They know, furthermore, that in the lately created diocese of Manchester, the Anglicans are within 50,000 of our entire Protestant population. They know, too, that the population of the city of New York is as numerous, and that of Paris twice as numerous as the communicants of the Establishment in Ireland, and yet they see us allow that sprinkling, the ministration of twelve bishops, thirty-three deans, twenty-six precentors, twenty-two chancellors, twenty-one treasurers, thirty-four archdeacons, one hundred and seventy-eight prebends, nine canons, and working clergy in proportion, as far as any of them can be said to work. Not to speak of London at all, the Bishop of Manchester does the entire work of the Irish staff for so small a consideration as £4,500, without at all satisfying people that they have value for their money. Let the English Establishment be regulated on the Irish scale, and it will require forty archbishops and two hundred bishops; for taking the English Protestants to be twenty times as numerous as the Irish, they ought to have twenty times as many bishops, that is to say, two hundred and forty, of whom forty metropolitans, making in all nine times and a fraction their actual amount of bishops. The inferior clergy being proportionably increased, the church revenues should rise to the modest figure of thirty-two millions sterling, or rather better than nine times the present amount, which according to the lowest estimate, that of Mr. Johnstone, in his "England as it is," reaches £3,500,000. Or suppose we invert the proportions, as was done by the Edinburgh Review in 1839, the Irish ought to have, not as that periodical proposed, one archbishop and three bishops, but one bishop and a decimal. To what purpose, however, is it that men know all this if we suffer them to believe it gives us no concern? It has already been said, and with great show of reason, that we are satis-

fied because we do not complain; nor is it for us to complain now, but to show our determination to right all our wrongs, and this one first of all, as foremost in our abhorrence, as most injurious and most degrading. If we are resolute the path is smoother than men supposed for the adjustment of our differences. What was pleasantly called the Irish church is acknowledged upon all hands to have no existence, but there is talk of a certain Irish branch of a certain united church of England and Ireland, pursuant to the statute in that case, made and provided. This being so, it can be no ground of complaint that we recommend, or even enforce, a stricter union between the branch and the trunk. Railways and steam-packets exist for the Establishment as well as for everything else, and even should the tubular bridge not facilitate so much as was expected the flight of the viceroyalty, we hope to see the day when the Establishment at least will vanish along its galleries, and bear away with it the evil passions, the sanguinary recollections, and sordid interests in which it lived. There can be nothing to prevent Dr. Sumner, the patriarch of the British Islands, as we remember to have heard him called by the university, from withdrawing his Irish vicars as soon as we insist upon it. Let him share the Metropolitcal jurisdiction with York if he think fit, and give the suffragans to whom he likes in England. This would be to cement the union in very deed. The Irish branch would then be something; not a sickly slip starving under an inclement sky, and struggling to break an obdurate soil, but grafted on a majestic trunk, refreshed with vigorous sap, and clothed with flowers and fruit in season.

These are the convictions that force themselves upon our minds, and this is the lesson we should wish to see conveyed by the books under review, which give a full and faithful picture not only of Sheil's own labours and triumphs, but of the passions, the struggles, and the characters amongst which he lived. Had the Establishment been satisfied to accept with more or less of an ill grace the changes brought to pass by O'Connell and Sheil, some of them unfortunately too favourable for itself, had it even confined itself to moderate and legitimate hostility, our course might have been different, but when a determination is shown to strip us of rights, the prize of weary labours, and sacrifices beyond reckoning; when we

are driven to that point that we must advance or fall, we cannot choose but advance—*Sursum corda*, therefore. The Catholics of Ireland have only to remember that they are the nation, and they will be sure to act in this matter with the dignity, the gravity, and the decision of a nation. They are appealed to in the name of every motive that can sanctify a struggle, that can make resentment virtuous, and quietude a crime. As they cherish the memory of the dead, as they prize the triumphs of the living, as they tender the hopes of those that are to come, they are adjured to remember the wrongs of their fathers, to hold fast the rights that have been won, to bequeath to their children the remembrance of the one and the possession of the other. We have pointed to their confiscated lands, to their invaded temples, to their massacred priests, to broken treaties, and parricidal laws, not to inflame animosity or stimulate retaliation, but as an admonition that the Church, which has survived all this, must not be suffered to lie at the feet of petty persecutors; that she who has not suffered the lion to destroy her, must not stand to be devoured by the wolf. Victorious over Cromwell, it cannot be her fate to yield to Spooner. If, on the other hand, we content ourselves with a timid, apologetic, unconnected, fretful resistance to attacks that are deadly, because they are linked and systematic, the world will despise us, but not so much as we shall despise ourselves; posterity will execrate us, but not so bitterly as we shall curse ourselves, and in presence of a nation degraded, divided, and oppressed; a Church mutilated, manacled, and useless, or worse; with every chain new-riveted, every wrong become immortal, every vice ingrained; we shall be afflicted by the damning consciousness that all has been the work not more of hostile fanaticism than of domestic corruption.

ART. IV.—1. *Lingard's History of England: St. Thomas of Canterbury.*
Vols. 1—3. Sixth Edition. London: Dolman.* 1855.

2. *Roger of Wendover's Chronicles.* London: Bohn. 1853.

THERE is a grandeur in heroic characters which conquers time. They tower above the ordinary level of history, like massive cathedrals, which, visible for miles of intervening country, seem, by their very greatness, despite of distance, to be brought near. After all the mutations of ages, the mind is fixed upon the few rare men who made the age in which they lived, and left an influence which lives in every age. This is true, indeed, in its greatest degree only of those who have laid down their *lives* for truth and principle: in other words, for God: and whose lives have been one long sacrifice and struggle, upon which death set the seal. The grave has no power over such great ones; and the tomb only is their triumph. There is, in the spirit of self-sacrifice, for the sake of Godlike constancy to God, a grand vitality which survives in memory. We speak of course of saints, the only true heroes—saints, who never die. Even in their ashes live their wonted fires, and from age to age they are green in an immortal youth; they grow in veneration, and vigour, and influence, and attract deeper and deeper interest as the stream of time flows on, bearing on its surface all things of an earthly origin

* It is superfluous to say anything as to the value of this great work: which Mr. Dolman has so wisely reproduced in a form at once elegant, convenient, and economical. Its general truthfulness and integrity as a history; the purity and lucidity of its style as a composition; the extent and accuracy of its citations of contemporary authorities, and the great amount of learning embodied in the notes, have long rendered it a standard work, among Protestants not less than Catholics. And if on the part of many Catholics we protest against being bound by all the opinions expressed, and still less against being supposed to sympathize or be satisfied with the tone of the writer on particular passages of our history, as, for instance, with reference to St. Thomas—these at the utmost are but blemishes in a great work, and we should even desire to differ from it without any disrespect towards its venerable author. As regards the present edition it is excellent in every respect, and reflects great credit on the publishers.

into oblivion. The current of events only brings forward fresh proofs of the truth of their principles, and the depth of their supernatural wisdom; as the world grows older they seem to become younger. Despite the lapse of ages, ties of sympathy, as they are better understood, and as our circumstances come to resemble theirs—draw us nearer; and they attain a more engrossing interest, and exercise a more attracting influence. Preeminently is this so of those who have been martyrs for principles contested in our own days. The duration of the controversy gives a more intense interest to the contest, and carries us back to the age when it commenced; and brings vividly before us the character of those who in its first struggles were champions and victims. And thus it is, that ever and anon by the topics and the struggles of the present age, we are taken back to the earlier eras of our English history, and there, high above dynasties of petty princes and miserable monarchs, slaves of passion and dupes of vice, at once tyrants and servants, rises the grand heroic form of St. Thomas of Canterbury.

He has been brought before us of late years in many ways:—we have seen the See of St. Peter assailed with vehemence for establishing, under the auspices of a Prelate who is known to entertain for the Saint a special veneration, a Catholic Hierarchy, in lieu of that of which the Head was, in the days of St. Thomas, the See of Canterbury:—before, in the age of Henry VIII., it fell under the slavery of that royal supremacy, against which he struggled in the age of Henry II. The establishment, by His Holiness, of the new Catholic Hierarchy, was an emphatic protest on the part of the Papacy against that very principle. And very recently, a distinguished ecclesiastic of the Anglican Church, (following the example of a long list of others,)* left her, avowedly, on the ground of his not being able to reconcile that supremacy with the clear teaching of the Catholic Church in all former ages,—that very teaching for which St. Thomas shed his blood. And now the republication of the great Catholic History of England brings before us, in its two first volumes, that very controversy which for eight centuries has troubled England, and in which St. Thomas won his crown of Martyrdom.

* Archdeacon Wilberforce.

Men like him, who were martyrs to *principle*, are emphatically for all time. They are not more for the day in which they lived than for our own: for *principles* are eternal: it is only circumstances that change. The idea is pressed too far, sometimes, as to saints being raised up for a particular period, or peculiarly fitted for it; as if saints were not fitted for *all* times; or as if, under the same circumstances, saints would not all act in the same way. There is another and a kindred error as to saints having peculiar virtues, or degrees of certain virtues. Saints have *all* virtues, and have them all in an heroic degree: otherwise they would not be saints. But they are called upon at different periods to display different virtues; and hence, the *manifestation* of the virtue being mistaken for its existence, some have become more remarkable for particular virtues than others. That the error, however obvious, is deep-seated, we can easily demonstrate. And the demonstration shall be illustration. We are perfectly persuaded that most persons have an idea, for instance, that Dunstan was a very different kind of saint from Bede; and St. Thomas from St. Anselm; or, to come to later times, St. Ignatius from St. Philip, or St. Francis de Sales. Of course whether they were naturally different, we deem wholly immaterial; since it is the characteristic of saints to merge the natural in the supernatural, and lose their own characters in an assimilation to their Lord's. So that as the character of Christ is one and entire, and heroic sanctity is in identity with it—there must be an essential and substantial identity between the characters of all saints, in all countries, and in every age: varied and diversified by personal traits, so far as mere *form* is concerned, but in substance the same; and not so varied as that if they were placed in the same circumstances they would not act substantially in the same way; in the same spirit, on the same principles; for the same purpose, with the same motive, aim, end, and object; upon the same ideas and views; and influenced by the same convictions, feelings, and affections. How could it be otherwise? all inspired by the same Divine Spirit—the spirit of Wisdom and of Love, of whose gifts of Counsel and Prudence they could never be deprived, and by whom they must ever be guided? This may seem to some so plain that it could rarely be disputed, who yet would be

startled if it were said, not only that Dunstan acted only as Bede would have done had Bede been in his place, but that St. Francis de Sales would have done what Dunstan did, had he lived in his day ; and that St. Ignatius, or St. Philip, would have taken the same course as St. Thomas of Canterbury, had either of them been Primate of England under Henry II. We are satisfied this statement would startle many a one who conceives of Bede as of a good, mild, Bible-reading Christian, but has somewhat a dread of Dunstan ; who is charmed with the sweetness of St. Francis or St. Philip, and has an exalted idea of the prudence of St. Ignatius, but cannot divest himself of an idea that St. Thomas was fervent indeed, but, perhaps, not equally prudent. It would be hard to satisfy them that St. Thomas had the sweetness of St. Francis, and the prudence of St. Ignatius. Yet if not, would he have been a saint ? Would he have been canonized for heroic sanctity ? Is that consistent with the absence of an heroic degree of any virtue—be it charity, prudence, sweetness, or fortitude ? We are not at all forgetful that the Church, in canonizing saints, often calls attention to particular virtues in their characters, as the sweetness of St. Francis de Sales, and the martyr-firmness of St. Thomas. But this, as we have already explained, is attributable to the special *manifestation* of the particular virtue, not its *possession*. And as the same voice that said to the roaring waves and winds, “Peace ! be still ;” and to the corpses of the dead “Arise !”—also said to the weeping penitent, “Go in peace ;” as the same eye that looked around on a throng of sceptic sinners, “being grieved for the hardness of their hearts,” did with its gentle eloquence move the recreant Apostle to tears ; as the same lips that quivered with holy anger as they poured forth denunciations upon the hypocrisy of the Pharisee, spoke with sweet tenderness to the Samaritan woman—so it was the same sanctity which in Dunstan rebuked the brutal lust of the Saxon kings, and in Bede pored over the pages of scripture in the peaceful recesses of a monastery ; which in St. Thomas grappled with the sacrilegious spirit of a Norman sovereign, and in St. Francis softened even the embittered enmity of heretics. And as it is a question not of the possession but of the *manifestation* of particular virtues, so there is an obvious liability to mistake, by reason either of the selection of some features in the

character of a saint for special attention, or of the absence of sufficient record of the exhibition of others. The first source of mistake is made the more serious on account of our tendency to fasten attention on such traits in the character of a person whom we know, as are either opposed to or similar to our own : and the other cause of misapprehension is partly a consequence of the former, which as it of course applies preeminently to a man's contemporaries, so induces them to record rather such acts or traits of the leading characters of their age as happened to arrest most attention, or cause most excitement in their own times. Hence from the combination of these causes it may often happen that it is no easy thing to get at a correct idea of the *entirety* of a saint's character, and we run a great risk of being misled by particular manifestations of certain traits in it which we may take for the whole, or at least the principal of those which composed it : whereas these were either such only as were called forth by the circumstances of the times in which he lived, or were those which it occurred to his contemporaries more carefully to record. And the distinction between him and other saints is not that he possessed certain traits of character, or certain virtues, which they did not ; that he was superior to them or they inferior to him in any of the attributes of heroic sanctity ; but that he was called upon to exercise certain of them in a greater degree than others, either of the same or of another age. And these observations are particularly applicable to such saints as have been engaged in great struggles with the powers of the world ; in whom as the grander and more heroic traits of the saintly character were more prominently called out, the milder and sweeter traits are in danger of being overlooked. Yet this kind of error is as unfounded in theology as it is in fact. For after all there is a closer affinity between these two classes of virtues than at a loose glance one might imagine. Scripture teaches us that greater is he who ruleth his speech than he that taketh a city, and the history of the world is full of instances of heroes (so called) who could rule others, but could not rule themselves ; who could conquer countries but were slaves to themselves. This shows that after all, the greatest field for Christian heroism is a man's own heart ; where is the soil whence all virtues must, by the aid of grace, spring forth. And hence it must follow that the control of self

which produces the supernatural sweetness of a saint to others, combined with severity to himself, comes from the same source as the spirit of martyrdom ; and thus it is that in fact we find (whenever we can find in the fact) that great Christian heroes are as remarkable for gentleness as greatness, and that as their greatness lay in likeness to Christ, whose gentleness was infinite as His greatness, they could not possess one fruit of saintliness without the other : and thus, as it was the self-same spirit of devotion to the Eternal Father which led the Incarnate Son to speak to the woman at the well in words of winning sweetness, and wrung from Him that tender aspiration, "If thou knewest the gift of God !" which afterwards supported Him amidst the agonies of the Passion, and at their climax of anguish made Him think lovingly of the soul of the poor malefactor by His side ; so it was the self-same spirit which played with lambent grace over the countenance of a St. Philip or a St. Francis, and composed with calmness for a martyr's death, the great soul of St. Thomas of Canterbury.

It is for want of attending to these considerations that so few writers have taken a just view of the character of that illustrious saint. Of course we speak not of those ignorant fanatics of puritanism, or those malignant satellites of tyranny, who blaspheme against him as hypocrite or traitor. We speak of those of whom there are not wanting many even out of the pale of the Church, who evince some capacity for appreciation of his character, or at all events some desire to do it justice.* Of these, perhaps, the earliest was Collyer, who quaintly says (adopting that *via media* which is so much followed in days marked by a dereliction from principle), "I conceive the truth will be found betwixt the two extremes" (i. e. of his calumniators and admirers). "He was neither so good a saint as the first, nor so great a sinner as the last would make him." Possibly this passage embodies in substance the idea entertained of the saint by the great body of the most enlightened and best educated classes of this country. And probably many Catholics, who could scarcely consistently with

* As, for instance, the writer of an article on the saint's life, which appeared some years ago in a Tractarian periodical, now extinct, and in which we found some of the materials, collected with loving industry, which we have now used.

orthodoxy, hold such language of a canonized saint, unconsciously have imbibed something of the spirit of the sentiment, and by no means appreciate the magnificent character of the saint. In truth it is hard to do so. Its very grandeur seems to baffle all attempts to understand it. Its greatness makes it difficult to grasp it. In some degree this is true of all saints who have been martyrs in a struggle for principle. It is true, of course, beyond all comparison, of the King of saints and martyrs. It is the task of a Christian life with all the aids of grace and sacraments, to form, to cultivate, to cherish and develop in the mind the *Idea* of the character of Christ. It is easy to form a conception, more or less inadequate of course, of particular traits in it; gentleness or goodness for instance. But the difficulty is to form an idea of it as a whole, on account of the vastness of its range (so to speak) and the apparent opposition of its elements to the minds of poor human creatures. This is a difficulty which necessarily must attend any attempt in the creature to form an idea of the Creator. The greatness is "past finding out," and not alone in His power, or wisdom, and other attributes, but in the wonderful harmony and infinite energy of the different traits or elements of the divine character. Possibly to lessen this difficulty, we may venture to say, was one of the objects of the Incarnation; indeed Scripture speaks of it in many places. But the difficulty is only lessened, though infinitely lessened, by the Incarnation. And the character of the God-man, is the study of a Christian's life, nor only of the Christian's, for the apostle tells us that the angels' aspiration is to understand it, and their constant occupation to sound its depths. Now this difficulty, in the degree in which saints approach to the character of their Lord, attaches to their characters, and makes it difficult for us to comprehend them. It is of the nature of all heroism to be above the comprehension of common minds; and above all must this be true of the only true heroism, that of the saints. They soar above us, and beyond us; we cannot measure them by our standard, their supernatural character tasks our feeble faculties to the utmost, to form anything like a complete image of it in our minds. And for want of the completeness of the image it loses, of course, truthfulness and greatness. The very greatness lies in the harmony of opposite attributes, or attributes which would be opposite,

but for the supernatural sanctity which blends them all in God-like unity.

And the very same difficulty it is which prevents us from comprehending the union of virtues even when they are manifested, and called forth into action; of course doubly disposes us to doubt their existence in cases in which they have not actually been called forth. So that we are on the one hand unable to appreciate properly the character of St. Thomas, or St. Dunstan; and on the other hand are ready to doubt if the Venerable Bede had the same views, or would have pursued the same heroic course, or to fancy that they would not sympathize with the sweet love of piety which was his vocation. Carried too far, of course, this train of thought would lead us into heresy or schism: if applied to *principles*, it would lead us to the old Anglican error of imagining, or affecting to imagine, (for surely, with Gildas and Bede before us, the theory of a British or Saxon Church apart from Rome is only an affectation,) that the early English church was not so devoted to the Holy See as the later, whereas the very reverse is the fact; and strange as it may sound to Anglican ears, (and perhaps to some ears *not* Anglican,) the ideas of Papal supremacy were stronger in the days of Bede or Dunstan than in those of St. Thomas; and so far from pressing its claims further than in a former age, he was disposed to moderate them as far as possible, and actually his only error was in having carried this feeling for a moment too far, and permitting himself to make a concession to the temporal power which Bede would have recorded as a scandal; as the saint himself retracted it as a sin, and the highest exercise of his pontifical or legatine authority never reached so high as Dunstan had done, with the entire acquiescence of the monarch and the nation.

This is, of course, an abundant vindication of St. Thomas even on the lowest grounds. If he carried the claims of ecclesiastical authority not only no further than, but not so far as, former prelates have done, with the tacit assent alike of prince and people—away go all the ignorant accusations against him of “want of moderation—of ambition, imprudence,” and the like. The English lawyer would require no better vindication of St. Thomas than that he “acted according to law:” and the most moderate Catholic would be satisfied as to the “moderation” of the saint, if convinced that he “carried matters

no further," or higher, than would have been deemed right and just by the Venerable Bede.

We of course can only draw inferences as to the manner in which Bede would have acted had he been an archbishop, in the age in which St. Thomas lived; but there are ample materials for inferences the most irrefragable. For he was an ecclesiastical historian, and as such, informs us how St. Augustine was ordained "the first Archbishop of the English nation," "pursuant to the orders received from the Holy Father Gregory,"* and how St. Augustine, by the same authority, ordained other bishops,† and how his epitaph was, "Here rests the Lord Augustine, first Archbishop of Canterbury, who was sent here by the blessed Gregory, Bishop of Rome." He afterwards informs us that the first bishop of London, who had been ordained by St. Augustine, went to Rome, "to confer with the Pope about the necessary affairs of the English Church," and that he sat in a synod there convened by the Pope, to the end that he might carry such things as were decreed to the Churches of the English, to be prescribed and observed."‡ He further informs us how the successor of Mellitus in the archbishopric, having obtained leave of ordaining bishops from the Pope, consecrated a successor in the See of London. He afterwards informs us that the Pope conferred the See of Canterbury on Theodore, the first archbishop (he adds) whom the English nation obeyed,|| i. e. the whole nation. He afterwards informs us that Wilfrid, being driven out of his bishopric by a Saxon king, appealed to Rome, and he takes care to cite the decree of the Pope in his favour, which ran thus: "Wilfrid, Bishop of the city of York, having referred to the Apostolic See, and being by that authority acquitted, &c." that this decree being read in open synod, and the Pope having adjudged that he had been wrongfully expelled from his bishopric, he should return home with honour. The Venerable Bede records this as the proper and regular course, and is evidently fully satisfied with it, and notes the result with complacency. Hence it is plain that in the opinion of Bede the Apostolic See was the tribunal to determine any dispute between a bishop and a king. We shall find this amply vindicates St. Thomas.

* B. i. c. 27. † B. ii. c. 3, ‡ Ibid. c. 4. || B. iv. c. 2.

In St. Dunstan we have another instance of an ecclesiastic expelled from his country by the violence of his prince. There is a striking parallel between his case and that of St. Thomas, up to a certain point. He no sooner had offended a lustful monarch by his opposition to foul incest, than he was questioned concerning his administration of the treasury during the preceding reign. This assertion of claims, stale even if they were honest, but palpably trumped up for the purpose of persecution and revenge, was the identical course pursued in the case of St. Thomas. Like his illustrious and martyred successor, St. Dunstan refused to give an account he was not called upon to give by any duty he owed the reigning sovereign, having expended the money under the order of his predecessor; he was accused of malversation, expelled from his abbey, and banished the realm. There can be little doubt that he would have appealed to Rome, like Wilfrid, if there had been any need, but there was none. The people took up his cause. That was an age of faith. They thrust the brutal sovereign from his throne, and restored St. Dunstan, who soon afterwards became primate. The succeeding sovereign was, as were most of the Saxon kings, sensual and animal in his nature; but still, those Saxon kings had faith, and when they had not, their subjects had. And hence it was, that for a foul crime committed by the king, the Saint imposed a seven years' penance and abstinence from all assumption of the insignia of regal dignity. And he was obeyed. St. Thomas never went so far as that. Norman monarchs were as sensual as Saxon, and more savage. Their own faith was lost, sunk in brutal sin, and in a great degree, the faith of the people had been lost amid sensuality and vice. Hence the Norman Saint found it not prudent to assume such high authority as the Saxon, and so far was St. Thomas from exalting ecclesiastical power inordinately, he never did what St. Dunstan had done, and stood (as we shall see) simply on the *defensive*.

Before coming to the time of St. Thomas, however, we must take a glance at what passed in the intermediate period. It is impossible to read the pages of Bede, or those of our early English historians, without perceiving a great change as respects ecclesiastical affairs before and after the Norman Conquest. Anglican controversialists have been accustomed to represent the Norman dynasty

as having imposed upon the English Church the “tyranny” of Rome. The truth is, they imposed upon it their own. And a yoke of grinding tyranny it was. Our legal writers are often puzzled to account for the affection and veneration with which the English, after the Conquest, regard the “laws of Edward the Confessor;” and no wonder, for Protestant lawyers are not likely highly to appreciate laws conceived in the spirit of a saint. No doubt, as that valuable book, the “Ancient Laws and Institutes of England” shows, the laws of the Confessor were partly the embodiment of laws previously existing, and some of which can be traced to the time of St. Dunstan, (and even earlier) and doubtless had, in a great degree, emanated from his master mind, and had received, at the time of the Confessor, the emendations of successive generations of sainted prelates and princes. The code of laws was based upon the authority of the Church,—and it was this which made them the object of the veneration of the people, for the law of the Church was mild and humane, instinct with the sweet spirit of Christian charity. Its great principle, of course, was obedience to ecclesiastical authority in all matters spiritual, and the subordination of laws temporal to the spiritual, wherever they could come into collision.

The spirit of the Conqueror was very different from that of the Confessor. He divorced the spiritual from the temporal, *and sought to render the latter paramount*. He did this by means of the feudal system, and forced it upon the Church under colour of the “defence of the realm.” In other words, he tried to make the bishops temporal barons, and as such to pay him homage and fealty. The pretence was temporal endowment. But the answer was, that the princes, who had endowed the sees, had exacted no such conditions,—that the lands of the Church were held free therefrom, and that they could not now justly be subjected to them. The Conqueror, however, ruled England with a rod of iron, and resolved to make his will law for Church as well as State. Then commenced the contest continued under his children—carried on through after ages,—the contest in which St. Anselm was a confessor, and St. Thomas was a martyr;—the contest consecrated at last (though, alas! at the downfall of the Church) by the blood of Fisher and of More.

It is interesting to observe the first outbreak of the great controversy. Mathew Paris having informed us

how William endeavoured to impose on the prelates the yoke of secular servitude,* and how many of them left the kingdom rather than yield to it, says that the Bishop of Durham dared to *excommunicate* all who invaded the rights of the Church.† Here we see the very same contest had arisen St. Thomas had carried on, and in which, it is clear, the crown was the aggressor.

With quaint and expressive emphasis the old English historians record the tyrannies and rapacities of William and his successors, from which the people and the Church suffered equally, so that they naturally felt a common sympathy, and yearned for the restoration of the laws of the Confessor. "This king," (the Confessor) says the *Saxon Chronicle*, "was of great sternness, and given to avarice, and greedily loved gain." "The king and his chief men loved much, and over much, to amass gold and silver, and cared not how sinfully it was got so that it came into their hands." And we find he took diligent inquisition into the property of all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots. Of this information his son Rufus made the worst use for purposes of spoliation, and in his reign commenced the practice of holding vacant sees or abbacies in the king's hands, in order to enjoy the temporalities, exacting large sums for their restoration, and St. Anselm made a mortal foe of the rapacious Rufus by refusing to purchase the lands of his see.

It is impossible to do justice to St. Thomas without attentively observing the case of St. Anselm. We believe that the most moderate churchmen have never questioned the justice of the course pursued by St. Anselm, and, on

* "Episcopatus quoque et abbatias omnes quæ baronias tenebant et eatenus ab omni servitute sæculari libertatem habuerant sub servitute statuit militari irrotulans singulos episcopatus et abbatias pro voluntate sua quot milites sibi et successoribus suis hostilitatis tempore volunt a singulis exhiberi."—Mat. P. 5.

† "Solus inter omnes Angliæ prelatos Egelnus Dunelmensis episcopus, exul et proscriptus zelum Dei habens excommunicavit universos ecclesiæ invasores et rerum ecclesiasticarum captores:" Mathew says, after the death of Lanfranc the Conqueror's rapacity burst forth—"defuncto itaque venerabili patre Lanfranc, Rex ecclesias et monasterias ferè totius Angliæ in manu suâ pastoribus defunctis retinens, gravè omnia populatione vastabat et instar firmarum laicis commendabat." Ib. 11.

close consideration, it will be found precisely that afterwards pursued by St. Thomas. This is a remarkable illustration of what we have already urged as to the substantial identity of the character of the saints, and the substantial similarity of their conduct under the same circumstances. St. Anselm, no one pretends, was a man of ambition,—all admit that he was a prelate of calm piety and venerable character. This did not protect him from the revenge of a monarch foiled in his rapacity. All the efforts of the king had been vain to induce the saint in the slightest degree to acknowledge his authority in the conferring of the archbishopric. The king had received the Pall from the Pope, and offered it to the prelate, who, however, *refused to receive it from him*,—only accepted it when laid upon the high altar of his Church, and took it thence with his own hands. Now, this, in the opinion of many of the moderate churchmen of his age, was sticking for a trifle. The Saint knew better. He knew it was standing up for *principle*,—one for which his whole conduct showed that he was ready to shed his blood, as St. Thomas afterwards *did* shed it. The principle was the freedom of the Church from royal control. In fact, it was a protest against the royal supremacy, which modern archbishops of Canterbury have so readily acquiesced in as their sole title to Lambeth palace. The monarch, in order to revenge himself, revived his father's impious claim to a secular servitude for the Church, and summoned St. Anselm as a feudal tenant, to answer for not having sent the due number of men to military service. The Archbishop at once appealed to Rome. The king threatened seizure on the temporalities. The Archbishop persisted in his appeal. Abandoned by courtly prelates, and exalted by slavish nobles, he left England as an exile—exactly as St. Thomas did under similar circumstances half a century afterwards. What do men mean who babble about the “moderation” of St. Anselm and the “ambition” of St. Thomas?

The *Saxon Chronicle* says of the king, “He trampled on the Church of God, and as to the bishoprics and abbacies, the incumbents of which died in his reign, he either sold them outright, or kept them in his own hands, and set them out to renters, for he desired to be the heir of every one, churchman and layman, so that, the day on which he was killed, he had in his own hands the archbishopric of

Canterbury, the bishoprics of Winchester and Salisbury, and eleven abbacies, all let out to farm." His successor, Henry, swore solemnly that he would abolish the injustice which prevailed in his brother's time, and that he would observe the most equitable of the laws established in the days of any of the kings beforetime, i. e. the Confessor's laws, under which the Church was free from royal control, and subject only to the Holy See. Henry I. so little respected his pledge, that, if he does not appear to have acted with such frequent and flagrant defiance of decency as his predecessor had, if he did not farm or sell bishoprics, he kept them sometimes vacant for years, and insisted on having them given to his favourites and friends; and thus the system was established under which so many courtly and subservient prelates were introduced into the Church, to play the part of Judas whenever occasion arose. St. Thomas had to do with some of them, as we shall find. In the case of St. Anselm the king attempted vehemently to drive him into submission, and refused him permission to return to England unless he would swear to observe all the "customs" of the Conqueror and his successor. What "customs" these were we have seen, and it need hardly be said that they were legally no "customs" at all, any more than the "customs" of robbers. The deeds of the Conqueror and his son were in notorious defiance of the law, and for this reason Henry had sworn at his accession to act, not according to these so-called "customs" of the Conqueror, but the *laws of the Confessor*. St. Anselm refused to yield to these impious usages, or to surrender the principle he had so long upheld, and preferred remaining in exile. The king seized the temporalities, but the saint continued firm, and returned not until, at a Provincial Synod, it was solemnly recognized, and that investitures of bishops should be received from the Church. Thus, in the case of St. Anselm, three great points were, after a long contest, established; 1, that bishops were not to be treated as barons, liable to secular servitude. 2. That their investitures were to be received from the Church. 3. That the pretended "customs" of the Conqueror and his successors were not binding on the Church. These were the very points afterwards contested by the crown in the time of St. Thomas,—a contest in which he became a martyr, as St. Anselm had been a confessor. St. Austin, therefore, was the precursor and exemplar of St. Thomas.

And now we come to the Saint himself, of whom we have chiefly to speak. He tells us himself that he had a pious mother, from whom he learnt the fear of the Lord, and the reverence due to Christ's mother, and to whom he ascribed that spirit of charity, which, however contrary to common ideas of his character, his *contemporaries* were well aware, characterized him through life. An ancient metrical life of the Saint thus describes her early teaching—

“ His mother him would all day rede (warn) and oft on him cry,
To lead chaste life and clean, and flee lecherie,
And love before all things God and holy Mary,
And serve them and holy Church and leave all folly.”

Well he repaid her teaching. No trace can be detected in his whole life of any violation of chastity, or any deliberate lapse from piety. He did not lose her until his character was formed, at the age of twenty-two. Fitz-Stephen, a contemporary writer, thus portrays his person and character in his youth. “He was of a placid and beautiful countenance, tall in stature, with a prominent and rather aquiline nose, active of body, finished in speech, of a fine intellect and great spirit, ever advancing in the path of virtue, of a meek behaviour to all, sympathizing with the poor and oppressed,—he visited the haughty and mighty, anxious for the advancement of his friends, and careful that due respect should be paid to all good men,—munificent and witty, innocent and yet watchful of fraud,—the wise son of this world,—the child of light.” Here are all the elements of the heroic character, and that which is eminently distinctive of it in the Christian sense, the union of qualities, “rare in their separate excellence, how marvellous in their combination;” the “fine intellect” and “great spirit,” the “placid expression,” the pure virtue, the courage which would resist the oppression of the mightiest, the meekness which condescended to the meanest. It is this union of rare virtues which makes the character of the saint so magnificent, and at the same time, so difficult a study. It was too great even for his contemporaries to grasp, and hence a monkish biographer, Herbert de Bosham, seems to have been not quite able to understand that union of piety and gravity which (its worst alloy a little vanity) distinguished the saint in his youthful days. The same biographer, however, informs

us that the young Becket sought the service of the primate *because of his disgust at what he saw among the retainers of the nobles*; which speaks volumes as to their depravity and the wisdom of the future saint. John of Salisbury, his friend, agrees in giving this account of his entrance into the service of the pious primate, an event of which the “Metrical Chronicle” says,—

“That he came to court and was in good office,
With the Archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Theobald, good and wise.”

The piety of Theobald bears eloquent testimony to the character of his future successor, for he continued his friend until his own death, many years afterwards. The wisdom of Becket is shown also at this stage of his career by his making use of the friendship of the pious prelate, to enable himself to study civil and canon law at Bologna and Auxerre. Contrast this zeal for learning with the brutal and sensual ignorance of the nobles, who hunted him to death. On his return he was ordained deacon, and made archdeacon of Canterbury; and in this, which was a very exalted station in those days, (as the archdeacon took precedence of all the bishops and abbots,) he displayed that union of piety and gaiety which, as before, somewhat perplexed his monkish biographers. All concur, however, in testifying that he fell into no vice, unless, perchance, a little venial vanity; and that he was free from any unworthy pride is proved by the testimony of his contemporaries,* who declare that he never forgot the duties of chastity—that his generosity was magnificent, and that he never was betrayed into haughtiness for others, nor into neglect of the respect due to his patron the primate. That he should have preserved the friendship of that excellent prelate is, as we before observed, conclusive as to the purity and piety of his character.

It was by the recommendation of the primate, supported by that of the Bishop of Winchester, uncle of the late king, that the archdeacon was made chancellor,—not being yet, it is to be observed, in priests’ orders. In this high station his conduct was above reproach, and the breath of calumny never could blight his fame.† There is a vulgar prejudice

* Roger de Pontigny.

† Grimm thus writes: “Sed in his omnibus licet aliter aliqui

against ecclesiastical rule. It is a prejudice which was created by knaves and made current among fools. This country has never been so nobly governed as by ecclesiastics. From the time of St. Thomas, through the age of William of Wykeham, and of Wainefleet, and of the days of Beaufort, of Wolsey, and of Morton—the most illustrious rulers of England, have been Churchmen. As to St. Thomas, the contemporary writers are eloquent in the praise of his administration. He found the land one scene of brutal brigandage. He quickly gave it peace. But we will quote Fitz-Stephen.

“In every third town had been established dens of robbers, in other words, hostile camps. The native nobles had been deprived of their paternal lands, and bands of soldiers from Flanders had seized upon Kent and the greatest part of the realm. The task seemed almost impossible, but within three months after the coronation of the king, William de Ypres, the robber, occupier of the fertile valleys of Kent, left the country with tears in his eyes.”

What follows is highly graphic.

“The Flemings in a body having collected their goods and their arms, take their way to the sea. All their strongholds in England are levelled to the ground, except the towers and fortified cities, built in older times for the sake of preserving peace. The Crown of England, the disloyal being recalled to their allegiance, is restored. The rights of their forefathers are rendered to those who had been deprived of them. Robbers leave their forest haunts for towns, and rejoicing in the prospect of general peace, turn their swords into ploughshares, their spears into sickles. Thieves, from fear of the gallows, employ themselves in agriculture or mechanical arts. Everywhere is peace.

* * * * *

That noble kingdom of England is renovated like the young spring. Holy Church is honoured. Vacant Bishoprics and Abbeys are bestowed on meritorious persons without simony. The king, under the favour of the King of kings, prospers in all his affairs. The realm of England is enriched—abundance from her full store

estimaverunt nemo corpore castior, corde humilior, sed inter humiles: nam inter potentes potentior ipse ac sublimior apparebat nullus eo discretior, nemo munificentior nec ipso prudentior habebatur. Pauperibus absque ostentatione, necessaria ministrabat sed ita omnia dona gratiæ exteriori fastu velebantur ut nemo nisi pro seculi pompa hunc ipsum etiam quum Archiepiscopus esset portaverat accitasse.”

fills all things—the hills are cultivated—the valleys abound with corn—the pastures with cattle—the folds with sheep.”*

How many modern ministers in their age of “progress” have left such trophies? Their monuments are national debt, disaster, and disgrace.

The *Metrical Chronicle* thus describes the Chancellor’s career.

“ When Seint Thomas was iturn’d from offe holy church,
In a great office of the world thereafter he must work.
Alto nobley of the world his countenance he broute
That men held none so proud, though other was his thought;
With more nobles he rode now, than he was wont to do.
His lorrains (bits) were of gold, stirrups and spurs also,
The play he sued of hounds and of hawks also now,
As men then thought in each point alls prute he drove,
And in his heart, it was another, howsoever he him bore,
And ever chaste, through al thyng howsoever it were.
And ever he was for holy church, and for pore men also,
Against the proud conteckours (oppressors) that would against them
aught do,
To hold up the rights of holy Church so much would he gan drive,
Against the lithere conteckours, that they annoyed him of his life,
As he, the Archbishop told weeping wel sore
And others of in privity that loved him the more,
He well nigh mist of all things, and on our Lord gan crie,
That he must with honour leave that baillie,
And each other service of the Court by the King’s good will,
For he might not pay his Court, but he should his soul spille.
And the King him found so stable, and so good counsellor,
That he would not make for nothing another Chancellor,
He trusted to none so much, nor was other so high,
That so much wist his privities, nor that him was so nigh.”

It was no easy career, as may be gathered from these old lines. The saints friend, John of Salisbury, thus gives his own account of it.

“ At the very commencement of his Chancellorship, he underwent such difficulties incident to his advancement, he was so worn down with labours, oppressed by affliction, surrounded by intrigues, exposed to treachery from the ill will and jealousy of those about the Court, that as he often said to the Archbishop and his own friends, with tears in his eyes, he grew day by day weary of his life, and next to his eternal happiness, longed anxiously for an opportunity of extricating himself honourably from the tangled

* Fitz-Stephen.

maze of the life of a courtier. For though the world seemed to lavish on him all the blandishments of adulation and applause, he was never forgetful of his own condition, or of the onerous duties imposed on him. Now defending the honour and safety of his king against his enemies, now standing forth the champion of the Church in her moment of need against the monarch and others who were hostile to her—now he was compelled to elude, now to meet stratagem with stratagem. It was, as it were, a perpetual warfare with enemies who each moment assumed a Protean shape. And all the while he was on the brink of a precipice, from which the least unfavourable breeze might hurl him into the deep below.”

Soon after the saint's elevation to the Chancellorship there took place a proceeding which would scarcely have been passed without his concurrence, and which we incline to think was, if not originated, at least adopted by him from wise and far-seeing views, that may almost entitle him to the credit of having planted the germ of our representative system. We have referred to the claim set up by the Conqueror, and alternately assented to and relinquished by his successors, to secular servitude from the prelates and abbots on the score of feudal tenure, making them liable by their retainers to military service. The king being about to engage in a warlike enterprise, in which he would require supplies, a plan was adopted which amounted to the substitution of scutage, with the sanction of Parliament, (in which sat the bishops and abbots) as a composition for actual knight service. The *Chronicle of Normandy* says, that the king being unwilling to harass by warlike service the agricultural population, or the burgesses of the towns, though by the law they were bound to serve in the war, raised money from the lands of England and Normandy, and levied soldiers therewith. This looks very like the raising of a land tax by the authority of parliament. And any how it is clear that the sanction of parliament, and the consent of the bishops and abbots, enabled the Church to concur in the subsidy without conceding the principle against which St. Anselm had protested, and St. Thomas was yet to protest.

Meanwhile the saint's patron, the primate, came to his end, and before he died, perhaps with prophetic foresight, addressed to the king a memorable warning. He cautioned him against the evil counsels of those who would endeavour to persuade him that the royal prerogative

would rise by lessening the authority of the Church. He assured him that such maxims, from what quarter soever they came, were unserviceable to the crown, and would draw down the Divine displeasure. That it was God Almighty who had enlarged his highness's dominions, and prospered him to that degree of grandeur, and therefore that it would be a most unusual return in him to lessen the honour of his benefactor and oppress the Church in her jurisdiction.

It is very remarkable that Theobald, the predecessor of St. Thomas, had been, in the course of his twenty years archiepiscopate, compelled to fly the country (as St. Anselm had been before him) on account of the impious aggression of the king upon the Church; and that his conduct in so doing had been approved of the Holy See; St. Thomas, therefore, was only the *third* in a series of archbishops who had found themselves engaged in this contest: so untrue is it to represent the contest as of his seeking. No one questions the moderation of Theobald, yet his course was just that of St. Thomas. To all appearances there was no particular reason for the warning; to men who only looked at the surface of things. Upon the death of Theobald, St. Thomas was made Archbishop of Canterbury. Herbert de Bosham says, that sometime before the king had intimated his intention to nominate him to the primacy, and that the saint endeavoured to dissuade him, telling him that he knew he was intent on a line of policy towards the Church, which he, as archbishop, never would submit to; and that the consequence would be a destruction of their mutual affection and friendship, and a potent and lasting enmity. St. Thomas had doubtless been in the confidence of St. Theobald, who, in the course of his two-and-twenty years primacy, had sounded the disposition of the king, and had learnt by experience the policy of the Norman dynasty.

At this time the saint was the favourite both of prince and people. As to the people, he was the first Saxon, who, since the Conquest, had obtained the dignities of chancellor and archbishop of Canterbury. As to the king, the *Metrical Chronicler* thus writes:—

“ So much he cast his hurte on him that on his ward he gan do
His eldest son Sir Henri and his Heir also,
That he were his Warden and his Ordeynour,
To wise him after his will and to the King's honour.

Both the Fader and the Son so much their loves cast
Upon Saint Thomas the Holy Man, that whilst it would last
There was none in Engelonde that hadde so great pöer
Of the kingdom as Saint Thomas that was Chanceler."

But St. Thomas was not the man to be blinded by this apparent fondness. He had known the character of the Norman princes, and his patron, the late primate, had known them before him, and doubtless had strong remembrances of the contest of Henry I. with St. Anselm. It may well be imagined that the venerable prelate and his saintly friend had often spoken together of that fearful struggle, and who knows the extent to which the prophetic foresight of Theobald may have carried him, or the high resolves of St. Thomas, destined now to fill St. Anselm's place, with a sovereign resembling him in character?

The saint had already enemies whose enmity arose from the meanest and vilest passions; envy, jealousy, and revenge. Many of these felon barons or robber knights, whose brigandage he had repressed, bore him a deadly hatred: but there were deadlier foes still—those of whom our Lord spake when He predicted that "a man's foes shall be those of his own house;" they were some of the saint's episcopal brethren; his brother of York, whose jealousy was aroused by the primacy of Canterbury, and some of his own suffragan bishops and courtly prelates, who had owed their elevation not only to royal favour but to flattery of royalty, and who, with no nobler aspirations than to similar advancement, and no better title to it, envied the towering ability of St. Thomas, and hated him with the fell hatred of envy. The chief of these was Gilbert Folliott, bishop of Hereford, who, as John of Salisbury informs us, was the solitary individual that did not express pleasure at the nomination of St. Thomas, and had been one of the aspirants to the see of Canterbury. With the sure instincts of a superior mind, the saint saw the elements of future enmity all around him. His former patron, the Bishop of Winchester, had the prudence to appeal to the Royal Commissioners formally and solemnly to acquit the archbishop elect of all charges in regard to his administration of the king's treasury while chancellor. And they declared that from the king's own mouth he was free from all imputation and demand. The very challenging of such an acquittal,

while it shows the archbishop's integrity, also reveals his prudence: and, perhaps one might add, his distrust of the king. Certainly it is clear that he regarded his elevation with sorrow—and when at his installation all around was gratulation and rejoicing—*he wept*. The sky seemed fair, but he saw the clouds gathering in the horizon: albeit unseen by common eyes. He remembered St. Anselm. He knew the king hoped that he had found one who would serve him as archbishop in the same spirit as he had served him when chancellor. St. Thomas took the earliest opportunity of undeceiving him, and urged the first occasion when preaching before him, to draw the distinction between the spiritual and temporal, and lay down the principles for which St. Anselm had suffered. The king's arbitrary temper took the alarm. And Mathew Paris informs us, that it awakened enmity in his mind. That St. Thomas had not rashly nor unnecessarily roused a sleeping lion, is proved by the facts recorded by contemporary historians. In truth, the king had, presuming on the supposed subserviency of the saint, begun already, almost immediately upon his election to the see, those very practices against which St. Anselm had protested. He kept bishoprics vacant that he might hold the revenues in his own hands, and he only let them go to courtly priests who would purchase or farm them. The old *Metrical Chronicler* thus records the facts in plain quaint old English, which we love to quote:—

“ Sitthe hit bifel that the Bischop of Worcester ded was,
 And Sire Gilbert Foliott (as God gaf that cas)
 That was Bischop of Hereford, ibrought was yut to moe
 And ymaked Bischop of Londone, that ne reude him noyt sore
 So that both the Bishoprikes falle both in the Kynge's hand
 Of Wyrcestre and of Hereford, as lawe was of lond.
The King ne gaf them nought anon ache huld them imme long
In his hond that he myghte the more prou afonge.
 Hit ne liked noughte Seint Thomas that holi Church so
 Scholde for a luter covertise in the King's honde beo ido,
 Him thoughte that it was wel mochal *agen our Louredes wilie,*
And that the Kinge myghte so holi Churche spille:
 In fair manere he bade the Kynge that he ne scholde beleve
 That thulken tui Bishoprikes sum god man he gave.
 The Kynge anon mydeliche granted his bone,
 And this bishoprikes he gaf tuie gode men wel sone.
 Sire Roger he maked a god man Bishop of Wercestre,
 Sire Roberts son that was Earl of Gloucestre,

Bischop he made of Hereford, a gode man ynough;
 Sire Roberts of Mulnes, that to alle goodness drov.
 Anought Sire Thomas thoughte wel that he ne might all paye
 The King ne his consail *but he woulde note Church betraye.*
 In care and sorrow he was ynow how he mighte beste do,
 For he might not pae (obey) the Kyng and our Loerd also."

Much need then was there for St. Thomas to recommence the protest of St. Anselm, and assert the principles for which he had suffered; and the disregard of which, as it was a violation of the sovereign's solemn oath, so it rendered the Church a mere slave of a sensual sordid monarch, and his sensual and sordid satellites. We can fancy the scorn with which the lofty spirit of the saint regarded these infamous parasites who tempted the king to acts of rapacity in the Church, that they might share the sacrilegious spoil. The same spirit of rapacity which prompted spoliation of the Church, led to plunder of the people. And before long the prelate had to be their champion. The king sought to sanction a monstrous infraction of law, by which sheriffs exacted illegal payment for the performance of their duty: and he wished to profit by the illegality, by putting the proceeds into his own coffer. St. Thomas nobly withstood him, and was the only one who had the courage to do so.

"What for eye, what for love, non him withstede
 Nor evere thoughte Saint Thomas that hit was an unrighte dede,
 He thoughte on God and on his soule and belevede manhede,
 And to the King wel baldeleche went without drede."

When the archbishop opposed the usurpation, Henry exclaimed violently with his usual oath, "By God's eyes these payments shall forthwith be put on our Exchequer Roll. And you are the last man who ought to set yourself up in opposition to me, *for no one will burden your tenants without your consent.*" "By the reverence I have for those eyes by which you have sworn, my Lord and King," replied the prelate undauntedly, "not one penny shall be paid from those lands which I hold of my own, or in right of the Church." The king durst not persist—clearly he knew he was wrong. It was a fundamental maxim of the Common Law, confirmed afterwards by the Statute of Westminster, "that no sheriff or other king's officer shall take any reward to do his office, but shall be paid of that which they take of the king; and that he who doth so,

shall yield twice as much, and shall be banished at the king's pleasure.* It was already an essential part of the birthright of Englishmen, that no taxes should be enforced on the people at the caprice of the sovereign. And that principle, at a very early period, formed part of the statute law of the land. "No tallage or aid shall be taken or levied by us or our heirs in our realm, without the good will and assent of archbishops, bishops, earls, barons, knights, burgesses, and other freemen of the land." Such is the language of our Statute Book in the reign of Edward I.,† *declaring* what the law was, and *had ever been*.

And the fact that it was deemed necessary to pass statute to confirm the common law on the subject, shows that there had been aggressions on the part of the crown, of the same nature as that against which St. Thomas contended: ever the champion not more of the Church than of the nation. It is said, and probably with truth, that in the course of the disputes on this subject, the primate relinquished his chancellorship. The king reproached him with having opposed him while holding that high office, whereupon the archbishop, at it thus being made manifest that he could not serve God and mammon, at once gave up the seals. The *Metrical Chronicle* represents him as saying to his sovereign:—

"Therefore ich yelde of her up here all clerie the chancellerie
And take me to holy Church, to God, and Sainte Marie."

As we have before said, it is not easy for common minds to understand the heroism, especially the supernatural heroism of sanctity; and we have spoken of their inability to appreciate that union of rare virtues which constitutes such sanctity; or rather its capability of developing and exercising any of them to the most heroic degree, which it may be called upon by Providence to exercise. Thus, as Herbert of Bosham did not quite understand the splendour and gaiety of the Chancellor, so John of Salisbury does not seem to have comprehended the saint's idea of his vocation as an archbishop. John recommended such a life of quiet asceticism as might have suited Bede in his monastery. The Archbishop was ascetic enough. His

* Stat. Westminster ii. c. 26.

† 34 Ed. I.

biographers record that he actually at one time injured his health by his austerities;* and even when he relaxed this extreme rigour, his temperance was such that he seemed the same before and after meals—quite unaffected by his slight refectations.†

“ Though he was in his dignetè al clanliche ido,
He gan to change al his lyf, and his manner also ;
For he thought he mighte well of other have maistrie,
If he had of his own flesh thurfout seygurye,
If his soule master were, and his flesh hire hyne (servant)
Him thoughte he might dignity bringe to God fyne (end),
Above they heren sithe the abytt of monk hid nom (took)
And sit the clerkes role above as to his state become ;
So that he was within mot without clerk also,
Thurft habit he hadde on him, priviliche ido
In penance and in fasting he was night ydai,
And in oreison bote (services) the while he aslepe lai
Ever wan he mass say he wept and sighte sore,
Faste he hastede therewith ne mighten man more (37.)”

And not only was the Archbishop austere in his own life, but he was diligent and devout in his sacred studies, applying himself especially, we learn, to the Holy Scriptures, particularly the Book of Psalms, and the New Testament. Not Bede himself could have been more ascetic. But asceticism he felt to be only a part of, or rather the means to his vocation. He was what Bede was *not*—a bishop. He was more than a bishop. He had the oversight of bishops. He was head and father of the Church in this country, and, under the Holy See, its supreme pastor. As a *bishop* he was careful and indefatigable, and most anxious to ordain only men fit to be priests.

“ Of his orders he was wel streit, and he was ingrete fere,
For to ordeini ene man bote he the better were;
Idle wolde he nevere be bote ever doing he was
Of eche manere of betere lyve never Bishop was (40).”

* Harpsfield, Hist. Eccl. Ang. 334.

† Hubert de Boshan says: “Sicut enim anti mensam et in mensa et post mensam ita semper æqualis ut nec in facie nec in lingua an satibundus foret an potius potuisset discerni. Et adhuc quod et miraculo accedit et gaudio sicut ex secreta confessione quidam religiosi ipsius familiares id noverunt secretius, non magis cibatus quam jejunos, nec post vina plus quam ante vix sentiens carnis rebellionem.”—p. 70.

And so as an archbishop, he had made a solemn resolution, and rigidly adhered to it, never to acquiesce in the election of a bishop of whom he did not in his conscience approve. But in the age in which he lived was this the whole of his vocation? As the head of the English Church was he not called upon to be its champion against iniquitous aggression? Of what use his care over his clergy, or in the selection of bishops, if whole dioceses were left destitute of pastoral care for years, and vacant sees held in the hands of the crown for purposes of pelf and plunder? Or if, as he expressed it, (at a time when *seven* sees were so held,) “*Clerus regni datus est ad satellitibus in conculcationem et prædam?*” An apostle describes it as the duty of an episcopal pastor to warn and to instruct. And the apostles’ Lord had described the good shepherd as one who does not flee when the wolf approaches. The saint saw his vocation and was equal to it. It was to lay down his life for the flock. His predecessors had suffered for it exile—he was to suffer exile, and more than exile. He foresaw his long years of sorrow, struggle, and strife, ending with martyrdom, and he shrank not from it. If the system which the conquest had introduced were to continue, what would become of the Church? Enslaved, she would be destroyed. He would save her, or perish.

We will quote a passage from Lord Coke, which explains the history of the era, and is eloquent upon the merits of the contest in which St. Thomas suffered martyrdom.

“Ranulph, an ecclesiastical person, and King William Rufus, his chaplain, a man, *subjacto ingenio*, and *profunda nequitia*, was a factor for the king in making merchandize of Church livings, inasmuch as when any Archbishopricke, Bishopricke, or monastery became void, first, he persuaded the King to keep them void a long time, and converted the profits thereof, sometime by letting and sometime by sale of the same, whereby the temporalities were exceedingly wasted and destroyed. Secondly, after a long time no man was preferred to them per traditionem annuli et baculi, by livery of seisin freely, as the old fashion was, but by bargain and sale from the King to him that would give most, by means whereof the Church was stuffed with unworthy and insufficient men, and many men of lively wits, and towardlinesse in learning, despairing of preferment, turned their studies to other professions. This Ranulph, for serving the King’s turnes, was advanced first to be the King’s Chancellour, after to be Bishop of Durham, who after his advance-

ment to so high dignities, made them servants to sacrilegious simoniacall designes. King Henry the First seeing this mischief, and foreseeing the great inconvenience that would follow thereupon, was contented for his own time to binde his owne hands, to the end the Church, now naked and bare, might receive some comfort, and have means to provide things necessary for their profession and calling. He thereupon, at his coronation, made a charter to this effect. ‘*Quia regnum oppressum erat injustis exactionibus, ego in respectu Dei et amore quem erga vos homines habeo, sancta Dei Ecclesiam imprimis liberiam fac ita quod nec vendam, nec ad firman ponam, nec mortuo Archiepiscopo, sive Episcopo vel Abbate aliquid accipiam de Domino Ecclesiæ vel hominibus ejus, donec successor eam ingrediatur, et omnes malas consuetudines, quibus regnum Angliæ oprimebatur, inde aufero.*’ He committed the said Ranulph, then Bishop of Durham, to prison, for his intolerable misdeeds and injuries to the Church, where he lived without love, and died without pity, saving of those that thought it pity he lived so long.”*

And this is by way of comment upon Magna Charta, which established the liberties of the Church from royal tyranny, for which St. Thomas had contested, and is especially on that clause which refers to the royal seizures of vacated sees, as to which it was that St. Anselm had struggled with William I. and Henry I., and as to which also it was principally that St. Thomas had to contend with Henry II. Who can question that St. Thomas was *legally* and morally, as well as ecclesiastically, in the right in the struggle that ensued?

How St. Thomas revered the character, and was prepared to imitate the example, of St. Anselm, appeared about this time by his directing his friend, John of Salisbury, to compile a life of his sainted predecessor, and an account of the miracles attributed to him—a work which was presented to the Pope with a view to the canonization of St. Anselm, and caused a bull to be sent to England empowering St. Thomas to summon a synod in order to ascertain the opinion of the bishops and clergy of his province as to such a measure. This shows how much the mind of the archbishop was directed to the emulation of his sainted predecessor. Nor was he left long without abundant occasion, both in matters purely spiritual, and relating to the temporalities of the spirituality. Thus, for example, one of the unruly knights who had profited in

* Coke's Institutes, Part ii. 15.

the pillage of the Church since the Conquest, (William de Ros,) resisted the archbishop's claim to restitution, and was supported by the king. The archbishop prosecuted his claim, and the courts of law pronounced in his favour. He made several other claims with the same success. *The law was on his side.* And the closer matters are examined into, the more it will be seen how clearly and how closely he kept to the law, whenever the law had cognizance of the case. In some instances it had not. William of Eynesford, a tenant "*in capite*" of the crown, forcibly expelled from the benefice a priest presented, regularly and rightfully, by the archbishop; who immediately excommunicated him for the audacious outrage, which never would have been committed but from confidence in the countenance of the king: a confidence which was not disappointed, for the king took up the case of his ruffian dependent with the utmost warmth, and made it the pretext for the open manifestation of that anger which had long rankled in his mind. The monstrous claim he set up, was that no tenant "*in capite*" of the crown should be excommunicated without notice to the crown, which of course really implied the necessity for the *consent* of the crown. This really involved the elevation of the temporal authority above the spiritual, and placed the Church at the mercy of the crown; to appreciate it, we must bear in mind that the most ruthless aggressors upon the Church, had been and were, the crown and its chief tenants; and the only weapon by which the Church could protect herself against their outrages, was that of excommunication. The claim of the crown, therefore, was that none of the ministers or irritators of its rapacity, should be excommunicated without its consent. If this was not involved as *notice*, the notice was an idle form. And it is obvious that the resentment of the king arose from the *fact* of excommunication, which in those ages of rude faith often paralysed the arm of the most audacious ruffian.

The zeal of the king on behalf of such ruffians as William of Eynsford, or William de Ros, contrasts strongly with his ferocious rage towards Philip de Brocas, a canon of Lincoln, who had been falsely accused of murder and solemnly acquitted, *to the satisfaction of the accusers*, who never attempted an "appeal," as they ought to have done, if dissatisfied. At a subsequent assize an old enemy of his renewed the charge: and the accused

pleaded first his former acquittal, and next his being in holy orders. The first was, and ever since has been, and is a good defence, and so it was held. The other defence, however, raised the same question as to the subordination of the spiritual to the temporal, which the king was so determined in every way to maintain. He seized hold of the case with that view, and because he could not in violation of the law secure the condemnation of the innocent canon, he fell into the most violent rage.

Influenced now by evil counsellors, the king resolved to endeavour to establish as law the lawless usages of his Norman ancestors, the Conqueror and his children, which not only had never been received in England as legal, but had been every reign solemnly relinquished by the sovereign in his coronation oath, as contrary to the Saxon customs of the Confessor, and the rights and liberties of the Church. For this purpose he summoned a council or Synod, at which he proposed these illegal usages for sanction. The Bishops *unanimously rejected them*. As this is the turning point of the saint's fate and the very keystone of his fame, it is to be carefully considered. We repeat and crave attention to the fact, the bishops were *unanimous* in rejecting the proposed laws, and again and again they repeated their rejection, in spite of all the efforts of the king. Their first, their *honest* judgment was *against* the usages which formed the basis of the celebrated "Constitutions of Clarendon." Yet the prelates who rejected them repeatedly, deliberately, and despite the utmost efforts of the king, included several, (such as the Bishop of Chichester,) truly courtly in their character, who owed their elevation to flattery of royalty, and hoped for further advancement from the same means, and also included some bitter foes of the saint, including the Archbishop of York, and Folliott, Bishop of Hereford. That even these men should have concurred in rejecting the claims of the crown, is "confirmation strong as holy writ" that these claims were outrageous, and the most triumphant vindication of the character of the saint who lost his life in a contest with the crown on these very claims. We should be content to rest his case here. But the career of his history from this time, forms a tragedy unsurpassed, in thrilling interest and moving grandeur, by any that has ever been acted, since the Passion of the King of Martyrs.

It is true that the prelates, including the primate, accepted the alleged "customs," saving the law of God and the rights of the Church, but they and the king equally were aware that this left the whole question open, and amounted to a virtual rejection. It would not have been so, however, if the customs had been *consistent* with the law of God and the rights of the Church, as in that case the saving clause would have been nugatory. This conclusively shows that the king as well as the prelates was perfectly aware that they were *opposed* to the law of God and the rights of the Church. Therefore he required an unconditional acceptance, and therefore they refused it.

Ultimately, indeed, one courtier-like prelate, he of Chichester, submitted, but this was a sorry consolation for the firm resistance of all the rest, and the king broke up the council of Westminster in a rage; and attributing its result to the fact that the powerful influence of the Archbishop had not been exerted in his favour, resolved on revenge, and sent a peremptory demand upon him for the instant surrender of all the fortresses and honours of the crown that had been in his keeping since his elevation to the chancellorship. Men saw some fearful burst of royal rage was impending, and the feeble hearts of the prelates sank within them. They made an abject submission. The primate alone remained unshaken, and they reproached him for his firmness and forsook him. His faithful friend, John of Salisbury, was banished. Forsaken by faithless brethren, deprived of a faithful friend, his grand soul was still unmoved, his lofty spirit quailed not at the coming struggle. "Let them do their worst," he exclaimed, "I will never yield to fear or favour, never will I barter with mortal man the honour of my order and my God! No: should such advice be offered to me by any, even in the form of an angel of light, I would anathematize him." His enemy, Roger of York, Folliott, now of London, and the Bishops of Lincoln and Chichester, sought to undermine his resolution by deception and persuasion. Still they succeeded not, until a nuncio of the Holy See arrived, and united with them in pressing upon the Archbishop a temporizing policy, and assuring him that the king would be satisfied with a nominal acceptance of his "customs," and would never force them into practical execution, at last extorted an assent to what he believed was, for the moment the better judgment

of his brethren and of Rome. We *rejoice* that he yielded ; for if anything were wanting for his complete vindication, this assent supplies it. Carefully considered, it shows at once the wisdom and the gentleness of his character. Firm as a rock against menace, or force, he yet distrusted his own convictions, until actual experience *confirmed* them. The confirmation was not long delayed. The king eagerly seized on the Archbishop's extorted assent, and expressed his resolution to have the alleged " customs " solemnly and formally recognized as law in a grand council, with the obvious view of their being universally enforced, and for ever upheld. If they *were* law, this was an unnecessary proceeding ; and if they were not so, it was unconstitutional ; for no council, save that of parliament, could be convened to constitute laws for the realm. It was at Clarendon that this council was held, and the celebrated " Constitutions " which were there proposed for the first time, formally reduced into writing, involved all that St. Anselm had contended against, affirmed all the tyrannical usurpations of the Conqueror, and would have destroyed the last vestige of that old Saxon freedom for holy Church, which was the soul of the code of law, towards which for a century the nation had fondly yearned as the law of the Confessor. Thus the first of them affirmed that if any dispute arose between two clerks as to presentation to churches, it should be tried in the king's court. How contrary to law this was is clear from a glance at Glanville, one of the sages of the law, and a contemporary with St. Thomas. " If the plea should be between two clerks concerning a tenement held in frankalmoigne of an ecclesiastical fee, or if the tenant, a clerk, hold an ecclesiastical fee in frankalmoigne, whoever may happen to be the demandant, the plea concerning the right ought to be in the ecclesiastical court, unless a recognition be demanded whether the fee be ecclesiastical or lay. " * And before the Statute of Westminster, 11, no writ lay for one parson against another, because it was the right of the Church and not a lay fee. The cognizance of rights of presentation at all by the King's courts was an encroachment, and it may be as well here to notice some proofs of this in the *Mirror of Justice*, which was extant in the

* B. xii. c. 25.

time of St. Thomas, as a text-book of the common law. Among the prerogatives and rights of the crown there enumerated most carefully and categorically, no trace can be found of the claims set up in the "Constitutions of Clarendon;" on the contrary, it is in conformity with the Saxon laws of the Confessor, and contains ample evidence to the justice of the claims of the Church. So in the Laws of Henry I. as given in the *Ancient Laws of England*, and which were the laws he swore to observe, even if he did not observe them, all that the Archbishop contended for is laid down, and bad customs denounced.* And Bracton lays it down that the Ecclesiastical Courts had jurisdiction over spiritual matters, and matters annexed to the spirituality, and he only assigns jurisdiction to the king's courts, in questions between patrons as to the right of presentation.† In the chapter on excommunication, no attempt is discernible to interfere with the episcopal power of excommunication, but only with the consequential imprisonment, an incident annexed by secular law.‡ He has a chapter on land given in *liberam*

* "Quia regnum oppressum erat injustis exactionibus ego Dei respectu et amore quem erga vos habeo, *sanctam Dei ecclesiam* imprimis, *liberam facio*; ita quod nec vendam nec ad firmam ponam nec mortuo archiepiscopo sive episcopo vel abbate, aliquid accipiam de dominio ecclesiæ vel hominibus ejus donec successor in eam ingrediatur. Et omnes malas consuetudines quibus regnum Angliæ opprimebatur, unde aufero quas malas consuetudines ex parte suppono." This passage points to the precise evils against which St. Anselm struggled, and St. Thomas protested to the death. And every Norman monarch after the Conqueror, swore solemnly to observe these laws. All the great charters are only reaffirmations of the principles here laid down. Yet at the time of the exile of St. Thomas, the perjured and impious king kept seven sees in court, and as St. Thomas expressed it, "Clerus regni datus est suis satellitibus in conculcationem et prædam." Yet with marvellous perversity, St. Thomas is caluminated as "ambitious," because he durst resist a tyrant!

† B. v. cap. 4.

‡ Ib. c. 11.

Item locum non habebit prohibitio si in curia Christianitatis agatur de aliquo tenemento quod si sacrum et per pontifices Deo dedicatum; sicut sunt; abbatix prioratus et monasteria. Item quasi sacra quia spiritualitate annexa sicut sunt terræ datæ ecclesiis tempore dedicationis, &c.

eleemosynam, and declares it free from secular tenure. Bracton wrote in the reign of Henry III., and no countenance will be found in his great text-book for the monstrous claims involved in the "Constitutions of Clarendon." One of them was, that no Archbishop or Bishop shall leave the kingdom, without the king's licence, a prohibition plainly pointed at appeals to Rome. No one who held of the king in chief, nor any of his domestics, was to be excommunicated until the king had been consulted; an impious pretension, the absurdity and audacity of which we have already illustrated. It was nothing short of a claim for exemption from spiritual control, set up on behalf of all the robbing and ruffianly knights in the king's pay; some of whom afterwards were the Archbishop's murderers. The eighth article of the constitutions actually prohibited appeals beyond the court of the archbishop, without the king's consent; a practical abolition of the papal supremacy. It is needless to enter further into these monstrous "Constitutions," the embodiments of an arbitrary will, which set at nought all law, human or divine. "These bad customs, detestable" (says Roger of Wendover) "to Almighty God, were sworn to by the prelates and peers, and the consequence of them was that the lay power was exerted without opposition over all ecclesiastical causes, for the bishops were silent, or at least, rather muttered their disapprobation, than openly resisted." "Archbishop Thomas, therefore, recovering his self-possession, and reflecting on his rashness in having conceded these rigorous laws which all Christians should abominate," sent messengers "to lay before the Pope the case of the Church, which was his own." Then commenced a series of persecutions of the Archbishop in the king's court, under the pretence of claiming accounts from him of monies administered during his chancellorship many years before, and for which he had received the king's solemn and formal acquittal on his election to the Archbishopric. The chronicler just quoted tells us, that "to escape from an unjust sentence he appealed to the Apostolic See. But the nobles and bishops whom the king had summoned for that purpose, passed sentence upon him, and thus the Archbishop, straitened, insulted, and deserted by all the bishops, raised his cross aloft with his own hands, and openly left the court." Nothing could surpass the simple grandeur of this description, except the simple grandeur

of the act. To prosecute his appeal, the Archbishop had to cross seas. "Thus driven into exile, Christ's Confessor" (says the simple chronicler) "was received at Sens by Pope Alexander."

This closed the first act in this great tragedy.—In one sense the most important act, for it contained the whole of the controversy. What followed was a mere continuance of exile and struggle—consummated in martyrdom. The controversy closed with the breaking up of the Council of Clarendon, and the appeal to the Pope, who, of course, denounced the constitution and upheld the primate.

We marvel that it did not occur to the great Catholic historian, as the merits of the contest between St. Thomas and the king must upon views like those of Dr. Lingard, depend on the question of the legality of the "constitutions" of Clarendon, to look to the most natural solution of the question, the Statute Book. If the "constitutions" had any constitutional force at all it must have been as statutes. But as far as we are aware, the historian must have searched there, or in the rolls of parliament, in vain for any trace of those usurped usages. The statutes commence with Magna Charta, *temp.* Henry III., which distinctly *disaffirms* the principles of the "constitutions." And Lord Coke, neither in his "Expositions of the Ancient Statutes,"* nor in his "Exposition of the King's Ecclesiastical Law,"† an elaborate attempt, by means of systematic misrepresentation, to vindicate the royal supremacy, although he goes as far back as the times of the Conqueror and the Confessor, (taking care, however, to say nothing of the *Saxon* age, except to garble the first sentence of St. Edward's laws, and then adding, "*Et hoc pro multis ante conquestum sufficiat*," passing on,) ventures not to allude to the reign of Henry II. How was this? The omission is most significant. And had Dr. Lingard been aware of the legal authorities we have adverted to, we cannot doubt that it would have much affected his views as to the merits of the controversy, and have shown him that St. Thomas was not more an "enthusiast" than a jurist. As chancellor he was bound to know the law. And he did know it, and was

* Coke's Institutes, B. ii.

† Coke's Report, Preface to Part v.

contending all along not less for the law of the land than the law of the Church.

The scene at the Council of Clarendon is described very vividly by the old chroniclers. The king was there in person. The archbishop, and most of the bishops, and the most powerful of the barons, were present. The *Metrical Chronicler* exclaims with simple emphasis,

“Now, God help St. Thomas, for he was alone.”

He was deserted by or deprived of all his friends. His very dependents had desired leave to retire from his service, fearful of the king's wrath. When the king propounded his “execrable customs,” as the old English historians truly term them :

“Sire, quoth Sire Thomas, if hit thy wille is
Ech man must speke for himself, and I for me I wis,
For my state and for holi church ich am sweire thereto,
That all the good old lawes that habbutt iben, and yet be also
Grante ich wol for holi church, and for to habben thine ore (de-
mand),
Sayf our right and our ordre than ne might esche no more.”

The rage of the king was such that the assembled prelates feared for the archbishop's life. Even the Bishops of Salisbury and Norwich—two of the best of them, (the latter of them having offended the king by his faithful remonstrances against his wicked life), besought the primate to yield. Then two of the most respected of the peers—the Earl of Leicester and the Earl of Cornwall—added their entreaties, warning him that they would not answer that there would not be bloodshed unless he gave way. “The martyrdom of the servants of God,” calmly answered the archbishop, “is nothing new,—His will be done.” The Grand Master of the Templars, and others of the heads of the order, came with similar expostulations;—“only honour the king with one word, in the hearing of all, and we pledge ourselves that he shall never exact from you hereafter the slightest concession against your will or order.” Again the same deception was practised upon the primate, that the concession required was merely nominal. He knew the king better than they did; the antecedents of Norman ancestors showed that they were eminently practical, and understood the applica-

tion of principles. Still, the archbishop, with that disposition to distrust his own judgment which (contrary to the common notion of his character,) distinguished him—**anxious to convince all that he was not stickling for a mere point of honour, or standing out for pride, or contesting a theoretical principle,—again yielded to these repeated persuasions, and expressed a readiness to assent.** But the king again showed the world that the saint had been right—for he eagerly seized on the concession, and demanded a formal execution of a document which, in terms propounded his claims—in order obviously to have them enrolled as laws among the statutes and customs of the realm. This was attempting a trick: for the primate had no opportunity of considering the terms, thus, for the first time propounded in writing, and this was a very unconstitutional way of extorting an assent to new laws, or a recognition of disputed claims of the crown. The primate perceived that he had been right in his first convictions, that the king was in earnest in his endeavours to enslave the Church, and meant no mere barren assertion of principle, but practically to enforce a power of plundering, or ruling the Church at pleasure. The archbishop then finally and firmly renewed his protest against the illegal claims, and refused to recognize them. We rejoice that he thus twice temporarily yielded,—for if he had not done so, it would have been said for ever, as it was said before, that he had waged a rash and useless warfare upon theoretical principle, and that he was actuated rather by pride than by any real necessity for so protracted a contest. The result proved that he was right,—that he was protesting against the practical enslavement of the Church, and contending not only for her dearest rights, but for her very existence as a vital living body, in free communion with the Holy See. Let it not be forgotten that the primate twice assented to what he believed to be wrong in principle, rather than enter on a rash and uncalled for contest, and that therefore, so totally false is the vulgar idea of his character, that the only serious error he had ever to reproach himself with, was on the side of concession and conciliation.

History affords no instance of persecutions more iniquitous than those to which the archbishop was now subjected. He was actually arraigned before the king's council on a charge of treason, upon some frivolous pre-

text, as to his not having obeyed the king's writ of summons. The sentence, if real, would have involved utter forfeiture of goods and chattels, but it was colourably commuted into "an enormous fine." The only comment which the Archbishop made on this most monstrous iniquity was in these grand words: "Of the justice of my sentence, let those who are skilled in laws decide. *Future ages will not be silent, though I myself am dumb.*" This was the language of one who had been for years Chancellor, and now was Primate,—a man the highest in dignity in the realm—uttered upon the infliction of a sentence of revolting iniquity. Nothing could surpass the grand calmness and composure of his character. Yet, he was assailed for pride, and his memory is now calumniated for haughtiness. The truth is, the nobility of his nature enraged his enemies, because they found it invulnerable to their insults and their injuries. He was too magnanimous to think for a moment upon his personal wrongs. This is one of the finest traits of his heroic character, and shows how free he was from self, and how destitute of pride. He refrained from excommunicating any one for mere injustice or outrage *upon himself*. He scorned to use the arms of the Church, except in defence of the Church. No sentence of excommunication avenged the iniquities perpetrated at Northampton. There only he was wounded. That dread weapon was wielded only against the constitutions of Clarendon. They assailed the Church. Who does not mark the magnanimity of nature—the genuine nobility of mind, which is shown in the contrast between his meek endurance of outrages on himself, and his inflexible firmness and undaunted courage in defending the rights of the Church?

The king meditated fresh means of persecution, and was bent, indeed, on the expulsion of the Archbishop from his see, declaring that they could not live together in England. He summoned him to another council, and showed such violence, and offered such menaces, that the prelates were in serious alarm. Roger of York said to two of his attendants, "Let us go hence, we may not look on what is about to happen to him of Canterbury." "Nay," said one of them, "I will not go hence until I see what the will of God shall have determined in this matter. If he shall have fought for justice and his God, even to the shedding of his blood, more gloriously and in a better cause he

could not die." In the countenances of all around the Archbishop saw apprehensions as to his personal safety. Herbert de Boshan, one of his followers, suggested that he should at once excommunicate his persecutors. The Archbishop declined to do so, with the magnanimous spirit he all along displayed. Amidst the alarmed prelates he alone was calm. He communed with his own spirit for some time, and at length spoke. "It is clear that great danger is menaced, not only to myself, but to the whole Church. In this strait I appeal to my lord, the Pope." His old enemy, Folliott, with conscious guilt, begged to be exempted in the appeal. "Neither you nor any one else do I exempt," replied the Archbishop; "but I lay it on the peril of your souls, and of your order, in case I am made prisoner or slain, to spare none, but do justice to all." The Bishop of Winchester pressed him to resign his Church. "Never," said the saint, "I cease to be Archbishop only when I cease to live!" He knew this was what the king sought to drive him to, hoping that his successor would be more subservient. He felt that it was for the good of the Church that the struggle should be sustained by one who had the spirit and courage to carry it to its issue of martyrdom, rather than that it should be miserably terminated without any determination of the principle involved. He had wept when consecrated Archbishop, but could not relinquish it, though he well knew it involved a martyr's end.

One of the earlier prelates, who found the contest extremely inconvenient, exclaimed, "Would that you had remained plain Thomas, and never been Archbishop at all!" and assailed him with vituperation and reproach. "I hear," said the Archbishop, and was silent. His self-control was unconquerable. The depths of his great nature could not be "idly stirred." The king, enraged at his appeal, in a fit of ungovernable rage insisted on sentence of imprisonment until satisfaction was made to him. The Archbishop was insulted by the king's minions as he waited in the hall. "There is no cause for fear," said one of his dependents, who had imbibed some of his nobility of soul, "the cross is our banner, and we shall triumph. You are the standard-bearer of the King of angels, and to yield would be caitiff indeed." Two peers came to pronounce his judgment. "I hear no judgment," said the Archbishop, "I have appealed to the Pope;" and

then, by virtue of his archiepiscopal authority, he forbade them to utter any sentence upon him. His calm dignity overpowered them, and they shrank back. The Archbishop then withdrew, amidst every species of outrage short of open violence. "This has been a bitter day," said one of his attendants to him. "*My last will be a bitterer,*" was the prophetic reply. Martyrdom did not, indeed, seem very doubtful or distant. The king declined to give him a safe conduct when applied to, and sent proposals to him by Folliott, and another of his courtier prelates, to relinquish certain Church property as a means of reconciliation. The Archbishop refused the mean proposal, and the king redoubled his rage. The Primate now resolved to cross the seas, with what feeling and motives the old *Metrical Chronicler* thus describes:—

"Ths holi man thoghte bi him : this word mighte wel beo :
And that hit was Godes wille : into another town to gon,
Anon as the godspel saith : to fleo alle his fon.
The hardiere he was tho : of londe forto wende,
Whan he might ascapie wel : that God wolde the tyme sende.
Tho hit was toward eve : tui serjantz ther come fram the Kinge,
And sore wepinge warnede him that me wolde : to stronge dethe
him bringe.

For the Kinges men hadde iswore: thurf heste of the Kinge,
Whar so hi mighte fynde him : to stronge dethe him bringe.
Seint Thomas thoghte another : he let makie his bed anight,
In the heghe churche: bituene tui wevedes right.
Tho other men were all aslepe : and noman him nas negh,
He ros him up and bihuld : on than ymage anhegh.
He ful adoun before the weved : and on oure Louerd gan crie ;
And seide furst the set sames : and siththe the letanye.
And wepinge ech halewe bad : his help forto beo,
And at ech halwe up aros : and sat siththe adoun akneo.
Nou Crist in hevene beo his help : for neode he hadde therto
ynough !

For him was to cominge sorwe ynough : as ghe schulle ihure with
wough.

Tho he hadde ido his priere : stilliche he gan gon,
Alute bifore the cockes crowe : out of the churche anon;
And wende him out of Engelonde : that noman with him nas,
Bote o frere of Sympringham : that wel privei with him was.
This gode man flegh al Engelond : for holy churche righte.
For al his wo ne ghaf he noght : if he hit amende myghte.
The night that fram Norhamptone : Seint Thomas thane wei nom,
To on of his clerkes : in avisioun ther com."

Arrived in France, where he was received with the utmost honour by the king, the Archbishop formally annulled the Constitutions of Clarendon, and excommunicated those who upheld them. His excommunications were confirmed by the Pope. The recreant bishops in vain appealed. The Pope dismissed their appeal, and again confirmed their sentences, until they should have made satisfaction. History shows that the Pope was the last man to uphold the Archbishop in any intemperate course, and his confirmation of the course taken by St. Thomas is the strongest proof of its wisdom, moderation, and urgent *necessity*.

But though the Holy See supported St. Thomas, its legates sought to the utmost to induce him to relax somewhat the rigour of his opposition to the claims of the king. One of them, a timid man, suggested to him that he should resign his see. The Archbishop scorned this cowardly course. "I cannot resign the see, observing the honour of the Church and of my own person. Such a thing was never heard of in my predecessors. The honour of the king, and the salvation of his soul, are more safe in renouncing than in retaining his customs, and this is evident, because not only has the Pope condemned them, but yourselves also, with the Church of Rome." It is obvious, from the tone of these negotiations, that the legates, while in conscience convinced that he was right, were very anxious for compromise, and very unlikely to uphold him in anything unnecessarily perilous. The Archbishop himself, in giving an account of one of the interviews, writes thus:—"One of them," (the legates,) "said that it would be better for us to give up every point rather than that the Church should be thus harassed; and much was said to persuade us to this." What the nature of these persuasions was he elsewhere also states. "They represented the stern nature of the king, the evil temper of the time," &c., topics likely to tell on a person of *policy*, but not on a man of principle." "They advised us that we should, with a show of devotion and moderation, endeavour to appease his indignation, if by any means his savage mood and unbounded anger might be softened." "We replied that we would render him as our lord and king with all free-will and devotion, all humbleness and obedience, saving the honour of God and the Apostolic See, and the liberty of the Church." The very "liberty"

which the Saxon laws made their basis, and which was always placed foremost in the charters which successive Norman sovereigns solemnly swore to, this the Archbishop firmly refused to yield, "for it would be an evil precedent, and tend to the ruin of the Church, perhaps to the injury of the faith of Christ." It would be grievous injustice to the saint's memory not to mention that the firmness of his resolve was not more remarkable than the calmness of his tone, and contemporaries speak emphatically of his humility, meekness, and modesty. Nor ought it to be forgotten that at this very time the king had seven vacant bishoprics which he refused to fill up; this was the very evil against which St. Anselm had struggled, not a matter of abstract principle, but a practical grievance. The Archbishop says, "*Clerus regni datus est suis satellitibus in conculcationem et prædam.*"*

The expression is very forcible, and significant of the shameful state of things against which St. Thomas, like his saintly predecessor, was waging so fearful a struggle. These evils, grievous as they were, arose inevitably out of the vicious system the king sought to establish, and the bad principles and usurped usages against which the Archbishop protested. And they served to show that it was no needless contest, no useless struggle, no gratuitous and avoidable strife in which he was engaged, already at the peril, and ultimately at the sacrifice of life. It reveals the supernatural clearness of his moral vision, that he should so truly discern the real tendency of principles to the true

* The author of the *Verba Domini Cantuariensis*, speaks of the *courtesy and unruffled temper of Becket*. The fragment from the Trinity Coll. MS. has this graphic portrait:—"Hoc autem dicebant, *i. e.* Legati, consulto ut animum ejus terroribus frangerent vel ad indignationem provocarent quo vel minus sapienter vel minus humiliter responderet. Dominus vero Cantuariensis *in omni humilitate et mansuetudine spiritus sereno vultu, radiantibus oculis et rosea facie*, lingua Latina facundissime et disertissime primum gratias egit." This is a portraiture as beautiful as it is natural and true; and it is a singular corroboration of the above description, that in the letter of the legates, in which every possible unfavourable construction of his conduct and motives is given, he is not ever taxed with irritability of temper, of rudeness of manner, nor violence of language. Lup. x. Ep. Lib. ii. Ep. 27. St. Thos. Cantuar. ed. Giles.

nature of which some of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of his time were comparatively blind. If the legates often hesitated we need not wonder that Louis was for a time deceived. But all ultimately discovered that which the saint had known throughout—the *truth*. And Louis, who had been by the arts of his enemies temporarily estranged from the Archbishop, fearing that his opposition was too pertinacious, exclaimed at an interview in which they were reconciled, “My lord and father, you alone could see! *you alone could see!* We were all blind when we advised you, contrary to God, to submit yourself to the nod of man rather than obey God. I offer myself and my kingdom to you; from this time I promise never to abandon you so long as God shall grant me life.” The vindication of the Archbishop may be rested on these simple words, extorted from the French King by conviction, “*You alone could see!*” Striking tribute to the supernatural discernment of a saint—ample testimony to the truth and justice of the Archbishop’s cause. Even those who doubted, or were disposed to temporize, at last perceived that his cause was right and just, and necessary for the sake of the Church.

The merits of the controversy must be determined, by any one who is not satisfied with the papal decision, by what passed between the first proposition of the king’s claims and the dissolution of the council, at which they were formally adopted by all but the Archbishop. What had occurred before the king propounded his claims were only isolated acts of violence and usurpation, of which those claims were the distinct embodiment. What passed after the ultimate adoption of the Constitutions by the king’s council, and their ultimate rejection by the primate, was rather the sequel of a consummated act. From that moment the Archbishop was pursued with unrelenting rancour by the king, marked for exile, confiscation, persecution, and, as soon as possible, for *murder*.

The great question is, Was he in the right? We have shown that he was—even his enemies themselves being judges. They all concurred in rejecting the “constitutions” until their fears taught them expediency. But St. Thomas was a saint, and has too much of real heroism in him to sacrifice principle to policy, or conviction and conscience to fear. And so, like his Lord, he was ready to lay down his life for the truth. That it was the truth, and

that he was right, we have shown from the testimony of contemporary historians, and extant text-books of the law, in which no trace can be found of the monstrous pretensions of the crown. And the king clearly evinced his own sense that they were but pretensions, by treating them as claims requiring sanction and recognition, rather than as established law, only needing to be enforced. Had he succeeded, the Second Henry would have left nothing for the Eighth, and the Reformation would have been anticipated by four centuries. The result would have been to make the Church his slave. The Papal Supremacy would have been abolished—his own substituted; his will made law in Church and State. That all this was not so was owing to St. Thomas.

Foiled in all his efforts to entrap the Holy See into a recognition of the uncatholic constitutions, the king evinced the utmost malignity of revenge. "At this time," says William of Malmesbury, "now that the blessed Archbishop Thomas was driven into banishment, his manors and woods, and other possessions, were confiscated, and what was not destroyed was committed to the custody of Ranulph de Broke, *a man very skilful in scraping up money.*" The seeds of discord having been sown by Gilbert, Bishop of London, and many other bishops—and Robert de Broke himself, who was one of the secular clergy, and was guardian of the archbishopric under Ranulph. And the next section of the same chronicle, entitled thus: "King Henry caused a schism through hatred of blessed Thomas the martyr," and commences in this way,—“King Henry, whose anger against the blessed Thomas and the Pope, who espoused his cause, was turned to hate, had caused throughout all England the obedience due to Pope Alexander to be abjured.” The Pope had, upon appeal, pronounced sentence that, as the inferior could not judge the superior, and especially one to whom he is bound to pay obedience, as to his bishop, that, therefore, the sentence by which the bishops and barons had presumed to confiscate the goods of the archbishop, was not only contrary to justice, but to ecclesiastical principle, seeing that he could have no goods except as derived from the Church.” “The king” (says Roger of Wendover) “commanded the Church of Canterbury, and all the goods of the archbishop and his clerks (clergy) to be confiscated, and *banished all his kindred*, an act unheard

of in all former history, without regard to condition, sex, or age.” The archbishop, from his exile, wrote to the king, in words of kind and calm remonstrance, which breathed at once the consciousness of justice and the spirit of charity. He appealed to him as his lord, his king, and his spiritual son: “Hear the counsel of your leige, the admonition of your bishop, the rebuke of your father. Remember the profession you made, and placed in writing on the altar of Westminster, to preserve the liberties of the Church—when you were anointed and consecrated king. Restore the church of Canterbury, from whence you received your promotion and consecration!” To his recreant suffragans he wrote in the same mild spirit of remonstrance, “reminding them how he had been dealt with at Northampton, when he was constrained by the injuries done to him and the Church, to appeal to the Roman See.” “Who ever saw or heard of an Archbishop of Canterbury being judged, and condemned to give bail in the king’s court, and by his own suffragan bishops? our clerks and laics have been proscribed; men and women,—mothers with children at their breast,—our goods,—the patrimony of the crucified, have been added to the exchequer, part for the use of the king, and part for the bishop of London:” his old enemy, whose enmity it seems was as sordid as it was bitter, and stooped not merely to revenge, but rapine. In the same letter the archbishop commanded Folliott to restore whatever he had turned to his own use, or that of his Church, of the benefices of Church property of the clerks, who had been banished the kingdom with the archbishop. The old chronicler tells us it was rumoured that while Folliott lay in bed he heard a voice saying,

“O Gilberte Folliott,
Dum revolvis tot et tot
Deus tuus est Astaroth!”

And that the legend reveals a true idea of his character—the very opposite to that of the archbishop—is curiously clear from the style of his letter to the Pope, (“presumptuous” as the *chronicler* truly calls it,) in which he recommends a “temporizing policy,” for fear of schism, and holds out almost a threat of separation from the Holy See, adding, “If persecution does not separate us from our allegiance, there will *not be wanting some of us, who will bow*

the knee to Baal, or, without regard to religion, accept the pall of Canterbury from the idol." He knew his men, that is, his brother bishops, but he did not know the spirit of a saint, nor the calm courage of a martyr. He continued contumacious—refused to restore the property of the see of Canterbury, and was excommunicated by his exiled archbishop. Gilbert was comforted by a letter from his sovereign, who counselled him not to care about the excommunication. Meanwhile, the archbishop's state of mind is thus, in feeling terms, described by Roger of Wendover:—"Such was the fire of tribulation and mental suffering, whereby the intrepid confessor, Thomas, even now suffered in mind the martyrdom which had not yet reached his body. He prayed without ceasing for the Church—praying for those who persecuted him, and with sighs and tears besought of God to preserve the Church. Who shall declare the sufferings and mental agonies of the man of God—whose brothers and sisters, nephews and nieces, clerks and ministers, had been driven into exile on his account, and himself, so exalted a personage in the Church, compelled to eat the bread of strangers in a foreign land. But seeing that no one ever arrives suddenly at perfection, these his sufferings were precursors to strengthen his mind, and teach him to bear injustice until he should be worthy to receive the honour of martyrdom from the sword's point."

During the Archbishop's exile, many were the acts and traits of character which revealed a spirit of sweetness and meekness, a mildness and affectionateness, for want of observing which few have appreciated the perfection of his sanctity. On his arrival at the first monastery which offered him refuge, he had endured such hardships that the Pope said to him, that though still in the flesh he might claim the title of martyr, yet no symptom of irritation can be detected in his tone, nor any unworthy querulousness. His address to the Pope, the substance of which is well preserved in the *Metrical Chronicle*, breathes a noble spirit of zeal for the Church, and of unconcern for his own interests.

"Seint Thomas wolde up arise: me bad him sit adoun ;
 Biside the Pope he sat : and seide his reisoun.
 'Sire,' he seide, 'ich am iset : thegh ich unworthi beo,
 To wardi the church of Canterbury : as ghe mowe iseo.

And thegh ich ne beo noght worthi : such fol nam ynoght,
 That the king scholde thurf me : in wraththe beon ibroght.
 For if ich wolde his wille do : and paye him of alle thinge,
 Ine ne scholde for noght : in such kontek him bringe;
 He me wolde lovie ynough : and al his lond, iwis,
 Scholde at mi wille beo : and alle thing that is his.
 Ac mi professioun ich habbe : to Jesu Crist ido ;
 And the biheste that ich babbe ymaked : ne suffreth me noght so.
 And if ich wolde bileve : ynadde none neode,
 To no man to go ous bituene : myn erande forto beode.
 Ac the church of Canterbure : was iwoned to schyne wide,
 And beo as the sonne among alle othere : of the west side.
 The sonne that was so bright : deork heo is bcome ;
 Blode clouden and stronge ynou : hire light hire habbeth binome.
 Overcast heo is with the clouden : that light ne ghifth heo non ;
 Whar thurf the churchen of Engelerde : idurked beoth echon.
 For a cloude hire had overcast : that heo ne mai noght lighte :
 The King that scholde hire governy : bynymeth al hire righte.
 Ich that scholde hire wardeyn beo : theraghen ich mot fighte,
 And stonde aghe and withsigge hire wrong : bi al myne mighte.
 For thegh ich hadde a thousand lyves : (as ynabbe bote on,)
 Rathero than ich wolde tholie : ghyve ich hem wolde echon.
 The custumes aghe holi church : that the King hath forth ibroght.
 Her ghe mowe hem nou ihure : if hi beoth to granti oght.' "

The Pope declared his only error had been in temporary and enforced assent to the "constitutions," which he pronounced utterly evil.

" 'None of them,' he said, 'were good, though some of them might be tolerated.' The greater part of them he afterwards solemnly condemned. 'But,' he continued, with kindness, speaking to the Archbishop, 'if you have fallen, you have risen again,—if you have sinned, you have repented,—if you have offended against the Church, you have redeemed your error by the noble stand you have since made in defence of her liberties.' "

At a meeting of the cardinals and other ecclesiastics, the Archbishop discussed his conduct with the utmost candour and amiability, gently chiding them for their having been disposed to abandon the cause of the Church at such a crisis.* Let it be added, that he had solemnly resigned his see to the Pope, on account partly of tender scruples of conscience, and partly perhaps at once to test

* *Benigna quodam et amicabili est asperitate objurgatus*, Herb. de Bosh. vii. 182.

and to prove, demonstrate his entire disinterestedness ; but the Pope had refused his resignation. Yet even this did not preserve him from many a cruel sarcasm and taunt as to his being the cause of the evil struggle that ensued, (which was as though the wolves should incite the sheep to hate the shepherd, who strove to protect them from the fangs of those wild beasts who ravened to devour them,) and for six years he had to suffer every species of reproach and mortification. It is a great mistake to suppose he was all-powerful at Rome. Three of the cardinals were his enemies. His English foes had great influence at the Papal court ; some of the legates were unfavourable to him, and the Pope seemed not by any means the most *firm* of those who have sat in St. Peter's Chair. But eventually, though not until he had suffered severe mortifications, his conduct was approved, and his cause was espoused, not only by the court of Rome, but by the king of France, and the great body of the episcopate and clergy of both countries, including some of those very prelates who had, by fear, been constrained to accept the illegal "constitutions ;" and the prior of Mont Dieu wrote after one of the many conferences which took place, that the king of England had, in presence of the king of France, confessed that the Archbishop *was an exile solely because he would not give an absolute assent to those constitutions*, "which," the Prior added, "beyond all doubt, were inconsistent with what was due to God and the liberty of the Church."* Remembering all this, and that the Pope had disapproved of the Constitutions, it is painful to read such a passage as this in Dr. Lingard's history. "Gradually the Archbishop's mind became tinged with enthusiasm ; he identified his cause with that of God and the Church." As if it was only "gradually," and by becoming "tinged with enthusiasm," that the Archbishop's mind began to fancy, by a sort of fanatic delusion, that his cause was that of God and the Church, instead of this being all along his deep and deliberate conviction, sustained by the Holy See, and alternately that of the whole Church.

Meanwhile, long negotiations ensued, in which the Archbishop only asked of the king, by the command and

* Lup. lib. x. Ep. 11.

with the advice of the Pope, that, for the love of God, and for the honour of the Church, and for his own salvation, he would receive into his favour those who, on the Archbishop's behalf, had been exiled, and grant to himself peace and full security, and restore the see of Canterbury fully and freely. The king exhausted every art to entrap the Archbishop back into his power, but would not consent to "the kiss of peace"—the sign and seal of sincere reconciliation,—whence it is plain that the king was *not* sincere, and it is to be suspected that he cherished in his mind fell projects of revenge, and suffered the dark design of assassination to dwell in his mind. He professed, however, reconciliation, and the Archbishop returned, for the sake of peace—from a sense of duty—but with prophetic anticipations of martyrdom.

Dr. Lingard tells us in his history that a "promise was obtained from the English king that he would at last be reconciled to Becket." The Pope had announced his intention to excommunicate the king if the reconciliation were longer delayed, and he then agreed that the Archbishop and his fellow-exiles should return to England and possess again their former rights, lands, and churches. A reconciliation on his part so enforced was not likely to be sincere, and the sequel shows that it covered dark projects of revenge. Under even the peril of excommunication he refused the "kiss of peace," which was the sign and seal of perfect reconciliation, and he would only bind himself by oath to grant it after the Archbishop's return. A promise was extorted from him to meet the Archbishop, and at the interview he professed to renew his ancient affection, and declared to his attendants that he had *found the Archbishop in the best dispositions towards him*, and that were he otherwise towards the Archbishop he should be the worst of men. That he *was* "otherwise" towards him, and *was* "the worst of men," is plain from the fact, that on the very same morning he had sworn to his courtiers *not* to grant the Archbishop the kiss of peace; and the insincerity of his reconciliation is apparent from this, that he did not even possess repentance; and that so far from any restitutions to the past, he retained possession of the archiepiscopal lands, (by levying rent,) up to the Christmas following, the feigned reconciliation being in July. "The mind of the prelate," says Dr. Lingard, "was still darkened with doubt and perplexity. Months

were suffered to elapse before the royal engagements were executed ; and when at last, with the terrors of another interdict hanging over his head, the king restored the archiepiscopal lands, the rents had been previously levied, the corn and cattle had been carried off, and the buildings were left in a dilapidated state. The remonstrances of the primate, and his two visits to court, obtained nothing but deceitful promises ; his enemies publicly threatened his life, and his friends harassed him with the most gloomy presages, yet he resolved, as the road was at last open to return to his diocese, and at his departure wrote to the king an eloquent and affecting letter." Even through the cold and guarded statements of the historian the heroism of the saint's character gleams forth. He went to martyrdom—he knew it ; but he saw it was his duty, and he went, with noble calmness, and with no alloy either of fear or anger.

But we find it difficult to be satisfied with Dr. Lingard's description of the Archbishop's first act on his return to England. "The Pope, before he heard of the reconciliation," (with the king,) "had issued letters of suspension or excommunication against the bishops who had officiated at the late coronation," (when the unlawful constitutions had been by them solemnly sanctioned,) and he had *afterwards* renewed them against Roger of York, Gilbert (Folliott) of London, and Joscelyn of Salisbury, to whose misrepresentations was attributed the delay of the king to fulfil his engagements." In a note the historian says that if one half of what John of Salisbury said was true, Roger of York deserved the title of arch-diabolus : but John was his enemy ; that is to say, therefore his statements are not to be credited. We utterly deny the truth of this statement, and defy any one to find, in all the contemporary historians, a trace of this imagined "enmity" of John of Salisbury against Roger of York. On the contrary, the contemporary historians are full of the bitter malignity of enmity with which Roger of York and Folliott of London had pursued the primate, that enmity having, in the instance of Roger, commenced even before St. Thomas was chancellor. And was Dr. Lingard ignorant that so general was the belief of the Church and nation in their enmity towards the Archbishop, that they were, after his murder, suspended until they solemnly and sacramentally swore that they were not privy to it ? But

that is nothing to what follows. "For the sake of peace, the Archbishop had wisely resolved to suppress these letters, but the three prelates, who knew he had them with him, had assembled at Canterbury, and sent to the coast Ranulph de Broc, with a party of soldiers, to search him on his landing, and take them from him;" (Ranulph being one of the ruffians afterwards privy to his death, and previously guilty of the greatest outrages against him.) "Information of this design reached him, and in a *moment of irritation he despatched them before himself* by a trusty messenger, by whom they were publicly delivered to the bishops in the presence of their attendants. It was a *precipitate and unfortunate measure*, and probably the occasion of the catastrophe which followed." That is to say, the publication, by a sainted prelate, of papal excommunications against bishops who had basely betrayed the Church, was a "precipitate and unfortunate measure," only owing to "irritation," and which caused the "catastrophe which followed," that is, the *murder*, which the Church deemed *martyrdom*, of the saint whom she canonized. So that in Dr. Lingard's opinion a saint's martyrdom may be the result of "irritation and precipitation," and of a measure arising from human feelings of anger!

This is certainly a view against which we protest, but still more indignantly do we protest against the misstatement of matters of fact which it embodies. There is not any foundation for it in the Archbishop's conduct on the occasion. So far from his publication of the excommunication being the result of "irritation," it was the result of grave consideration, as the saint's letters about it show. He resolved upon it on account, chiefly, of their renewed confirmation of the schismatical "constitutions" at the coronation. The Archbishop's enemies were on the point of embarking for Normandy when they were served with the letters of excommunication and suspension, which the Archbishop had sent from France: before he embarked he heard of the successful service of them;* and not until *after* then did he hear that bodies of troops were stationed at the port at which he should land, in order to take him prisoner.† The Archbishop's noble answer was, "Eng-

* St. Thos. Cantuar. i. 158.

† Ibid. vii. 310, 316.

land is in sight, and by God's help I will go thither ; but I know that death awaits me." It would have been better to have recorded these magnanimous words of the saint than to have misrepresented the facts, in order to derogate from the honour of his martyrdom by representing it as the result of "irritation" and "precipitation."

What spirit he had exhibited in his exile the Pope testified in the letter he wrote to him,—“anxiety of heart and bitterness of soul overwhelm us when we reflect on the anguish, the burdens and the wrongs, which you have so long and so unflinchingly maintained in the cause of justice,—but that you might fill up the measure of your virtue, you persevered in your purpose, unconquered by adversity, for which we *laud your admirable fortitude, and congratulate you heartily in the Lord for such long suffering.*” The spirit which he had supported in exile he sustained on his return—with the same fortitude which enabled him to endure he was now prepared to *act*; although, with the full consciousness that the result would be martyrdom. He had no idea of relinquishing the principle for which he had so long struggled, and so severely suffered. And the moment he landed in England he was called on to assert it. In his absence the Archbishop of York,—not only irregularly, as it was usurping a privilege pertaining to the see of Canterbury, but directly in contravention of an express prohibition from the Pope—had dared, with the assistance of several suffragan bishops of that see, to crown the king's son, and to do so without exacting from him the constitutional oath to observe the liberties and rights of the Church. The first act of St. Thomas after his return was to suspend the contumacious prelates. In his letter to the Archbishop of York he thus explains and enforces his reasons:—“It appears that the oath prescribed for the maintenance of the Church's liberties was not only not taken, but not even demanded by you, and that on the contrary, the unjust customs of the kingdom, by which the liberty of the Church is in danger of being lost, were ratified by oath, and held to be binding for ever.” These were the very “constitutions” which the Pope had denounced, and against which the primate had protested, even to exile and confiscation, and even to peril of death, and was prepared to resist even unto death. To have tamely and tacitly acquiesced in this contumacious act of the Archbishop of York would

have been the grossest inconsistency, or the most utter abandonment of the cause which the primate deemed sacred. He had, therefore, no alternative. The old chronicler informs us that,

“Archbishop Thomas also, by virtue of another letter from the Pope, suspended from their episcopal functions, the bishops of London, Salisbury, Exeter, Chester, Rochester, St. Asaph, and Llandaff, as well as the others who had assisted at the coronation aforesaid. The Pope’s letter was as follows: ‘The cause for which our venerable brother Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury, and legate of the Apostolic See, has been driven into exile, need not now be explained to you, because you were present to witness it, and because the rumour of it has spread through all the Church of the West. But whereas Theobald, of pious memory, formerly archbishop of Canterbury, and predecessor of the present archbishop, placed the crown on the head of the king of England, and by these means the Church of Canterbury has, as it were, the right of exercising this office, you have not now hesitated, in defiance of our apostolic letters to the contrary, to aid in the coronation of the new king, though the archbishop had not been informed of it, and the ceremony took place in his own province; you, who ought to have lightened the archbishop’s exile by such consolations as were in your power, have rather aggravated the case against him, and we grieve to say it, added to the pain of his wounds.’

“When the venerable Archbishop of Canterbury had returned to his Church, amid the rejoicings and pious devotion of both clergy and people, the king’s officials immediately approached him, with orders from their master, to absolve the suspended bishops and others whom he had excommunicated, on the plea that whatever was done against them redounded to the injury and subversion of the customs of the kingdom. The archbishop replied that, if the excommunicated bishops would swear, according to the form which the Church prescribes, that they would abide by the Pope’s commands, he would, for the peace of the Church, and out of regard for the king, consent to absolve them. When this was reported to the bishops, they replied that they could not take an oath of this kind without the king’s consent. Shortly afterwards the archbishop went to visit the young king at Woodstock, but was met by messengers, who, in the king’s name, commanded him to go no further, but to return to his Church. He accordingly returned to Kent, and there made preparation to celebrate the season of Christmas, which was approaching.”

Matthew Paris here asserts the following:

“And when these threats increased against him, he obeyed them, for his hour was not yet come. He therefore spent some days at his manor of Harwes, seven miles from the monastery of St. Albans, and kept the festival there; and the man of God showed no signs of trouble.

The abbot of St. Albans supplied him with abundance of provisions, and the archbishop in returning him thanks, civilly said, 'I accept his presents, but would rather have his presence.' And the servant said to him, 'My lord, he is at the door, coming to see you.' On which the archbishop met him at the door. After he and the abbot, by name Simon, had kissed each other, they had a long conversation. The archbishop then asked the abbot to go to the young king at Woodstock, and to advise him in gentle, though efficient words, to soften the hatred which he cherished against him. The abbot, in compliance with the archbishop's wish, went at once to the king; but meeting with nothing but pride and anger, he returned without effecting anything. On his telling the archbishop with sorrow the result of his application, that prelate answered with a sigh, 'Be it so, be it so!' And, shaking his head, as if with the voice of a prophet, 'Art thou in such haste for the end to approach?' The abbot at the time did not understand these words, but they were afterwards clear to him. The archbishop casting an affectionate and almost weeping eye on the abbot, said to him, 'My Lord Abbot, I return you thanks for the trouble you have taken, useless though it has been.'

"To heal the sick the leech's art sometimes will fail,
And, spite of remedies, disease weigh down the scale.

"And he added, 'but the king himself will pass sentence without delay;' and looking at the priests sitting round him, he continued, 'How is this, my friends? this abbot, who is in no way bound to me, has shown me more civility and kindness, than all my brethren and suffragan priests;' for the abbot on his departure to Woodstock had ordered his cellarer to send liberal supplies daily to the archbishop who was living near. The abbot, previous to his return home, with clasped hands, earnestly entreated the archbishop in his kindness to honour the abbey of St. Albans with his much wished for presence at the approaching Christmas, and to keep that festival, as well as that of the first English martyr, at that place. The archprelate replied with tears, 'Oh! how willingly would I do so, but far otherwise is it decreed; go in peace, beloved father abbot; go to your sanctuary, which may God have in His keeping; but I am going to do what will be a sufficient reason for not coming to you. But rather do you, if it can be so, come with me to be my guest, and a consoler to me in the troubles which encompass me.' The abbot refused this, because it was necessary for him to be present at his abbey on the occasion of such a great festival, and after receiving the archbishop's blessing, departed. But afterwards often was his heart rent with sorrow and lamentation that it had not been permitted him to enter into glory in conjunction with such a great martyr. The archbishop hastened his journey to his Church to keep Christmas, and in the eight days of the feast departed to the Lord."

What could be more beautiful or pathetic than this picture of Christian heroism? To our minds there is something perfectly apostolic in the tone and demeanour which the Archbishop displayed in these his last days. His end was at hand, and the crown of martyrdom was about to be won. That his murder was the result of the publication of the excommunication against the recreant prelates is clear. They exasperated the king by their misrepresentations, and then it was he uttered openly the words which were themselves sufficient warrant to his minions to do a deed of blood on his behalf, but which, in our opinion, were only the betrayal of the more deadly design he had already formed in secret: and when we reflect on the tremendous responsibility of murdering the primate, and remember that the murderers *were housed for a whole year in one of the king's castles,* and were never brought to justice*, it seems idle to doubt the king's privity to the murder. And certainly if anything could palliate his guilt, the view taken by Dr. Lingard of the saint's conduct would do so; and if king Henry took that view, no wonder he was provoked to the deed of blood. For *one* act of "irritation" and "precipitation" may *excuse* another: and if the excommunication of the recreant ministers of a ruffianly prince was "an unfortunate" measure, then the murder of the primate might possibly be extenuated as "an unfortunate affair." The truth is, that throughout Dr. Lingard's history of these transactions we may look in vain for any adequate appreciation of the importance of the principles at stake, and he who looks with calmness on the contest, will speak with tameness of the consummation, even though it is the martyrdom of a saint. That he fell in the cause of the Church, and in defence of her undoubted rights, is manifest from the fact that when his murderers burst in upon him, their demand upon him on behalf of the king was, that he should restore the suspended prelates, and absolve those whom he had excommunicated,—they having been suspended and excommunicated on account of their maintenance of the unlawful claims of the crown. And when they shortly after made their murderous attack upon him, he exclaimed: "I am ready to die—for I prefer the main-

* Roger of Wendover.

tenance of justice and the liberties of the Church to my own life,"—and his dying words were, "To God and holy Mary I commend my soul and the cause of the Church." If ever there was a glorious martyrdom in a glorious cause it was the martyrdom of St. Thomas. He fell in the defence of the liberties of England, which were involved in the liberties of the Church, and were always linked therewith with great charters, which his blood helped to win. The first fruits of his death were, that the king solemnly renounced the iniquitous claims which the martyred prelate had contested, and swore to allow appeals to the Holy See, and annul the customs introduced in his times contrary to the liberties of the Church. The ultimate result of the martyrdom of St. Thomas was, that his successors, emulating his noble example, under the sanction of the Holy See, won from the Norman dynasty those charters which laid broad and deep the foundation of our English constitution and our English freedom. The martyr's blood won his country liberty, and his ungrateful countrymen have learnt to detest him for "ambition," or despise him for "superstition!"

When the successor of St. Thomas was elected, Roger of Wendover takes care to inform us, that he swore fealty to the king, "saving his order," (the very ends the saint had so stickled for was saving the rights of the Church,) and "no mention was made of observing the customs of the kingdom,"—those *malas consuetudines* against which he had protested unto death—the bad and wicked customs of the new Norman dynasty, opposed to the ancient English customs, which they had sworn to observe, and which future charters bound them to respect. The Chronicler adds, "this took place at Westminster, with the consent of the king's justiciary." It seems rather strange, that in despite of this, Dr. Lingard should have supposed that the constitutions of Clarendon were annulled. They were annulled as much as they could be, and in the same way in which they were attempted to be established, namely, by the oath of the primate under the sanction of his sovereign. The Chronicler adds: "In the council were also read the Pope's letter, in the audience of all the bishops and barons, containing the following:—'We admonish you, and by an apostolical authority, strictly command you to celebrate every year the day of the *glorious martyr* Thomas, namely, the day on which he suffered, and

endeavour by votive prayers to him to obtain the pardon of your sins,—that he who for Christ's sake bravely endured exile during his life, and martyrdom in death, may intercede for you to God through the earnest supplications of the faithful." "The letter was hardly read," says the Chronicler, "when all raised their voices on high, and cried, We praise Thee, O God."* Truly does Dr. Lingard say of the martyr, "the moment of his death was the triumph of his cause."

There was another thing solemnly guaranteed by the king, and for which both St. Anselm and St. Thomas had contended, and that was freedom of canonical election. And this was the "freedom" of the English Church, which all the great charters subsequently confirmed, although modern Anglican controversialists fancy, or affect to fancy, that it implied freedom from the Holy See! A very likely stipulation for these saints to have struggled for, or to be insisted on by the legates of the See of Rome, whose names stand foremost amongst those who gained those charters which form the ground of all our liberties. Dr. Lingard, indeed, states, that four years elapsed after the martyrdom of St. Thomas before the question was terminated. He adds: "During this interval the Constitutions of Clarendon, though still unrepealed, were not enforced, *and the secular and spiritual tribunals, though actuated by the same spirit of rivalry, preferred their respective claims with unusual moderation.*" It is painful to us to have to comment upon such a passage, but its import plainly is, that the whole contest in which the martyr had suffered was a mere matter of "rivalry between the secular and spiritual tribunals," in which "rivalry" they had hitherto displayed in an equal degree want of

* Contrast this with the tone of the following passage from Dr. Lingard:—"Thus perished this *extraordinary man*," (Nero and Napoleon were extraordinary men,) "a martyr to what he *deemed to be his duty*,"—(Cromwell did what he *deemed to be his duty*,) "the preservation of the immunities of the Church." Putting this together with the passages in which the Archbishop's mind is described as gradually becoming tinged with enthusiasm, and as giving way to irritation, and betrayed into precipitate and unfortunate measures,—what an admirable idea we have of the character of a Saint and Martyr! These, however, are rather shortcomings than positive errors in this great history.

moderation, for their present moderation is described as "universal." It is impossible to permit such a passage to pass without thus much of comment—we should hope that to most, if not all of our readers, *more* would be unnecessary. Dr. Lingard proceeds to quote an original letter from the king to the Pope, mentioning that at a council held at Northampton several points had been conceded to the Church, among which was this, that no bishopric or abbey should be kept in the king's hands longer than a year: and the historian adds in a note, that general modern writers tell us that in this council the Constitutions of Clarendon were confirmed; but that they have been reversed by an interpolation in the text of Gervase, who states that the assize of Clarendon was renewed, "*pro cujus execrandis institutis beatus martyr Thomas exulavit et martyro coronatus est.*" Dr. Lingard thought the "assize" of Clarendon different from the "constitutions." He may have been correct; and if he was right in supposing that the constitutions had not been annulled, most probably he was so. But whether or not they had formally been annulled, (and it is not easy to see how such irregular assertions of right could be annulled except by solemn disavowal on the part of the crown,) most certainly the king had publicly and solemnly sworn to abolish them. And it appears to us more probable from his notorious perfidy, that he was at Northampton seeking insidiously to restore the "constitutions," which he had sworn to abolish. However that might be, we need hardly remind our readers that in the reign of John and Henry III. the charters were extorted by the Church with the aid of the nobles, and established that freedom which was only, so far as the Church was concerned, thenceforth only gradually and insidiously sapped by a long course of legislation; which while our interests, inimical in principle, was at all events very different from the iniquitous and truculent tyranny which St. Thomas may be said to have struck down.

The whole of Christendom did justice to the martyr, and embalmed his heroic character in their memories. They did not wait for future ages; and the Christian nations, who had in life venerated him as a hero, now worshipped him as a saint. All England hallowed his grave; all Europe hurried to his tomb; and the "blessed Thomas" was the object of more universal and affection-

ate veneration than had ever been known perhaps since the apostles sealed their witness with their blood. And truly, since the age of the apostles, it would be hard to point out a saint who had afforded a more perfect portraiture of the apostles' Lord. Seldom in the history of the Church has it happened to a saint to unite in his single character so many Catholic traits, and exhibit in his career such varied forms of heroic virtue. Not often is it given to a saint to harmonize and show forth so much of the life and character of his Lord. His holy childhood and his pure youth—His exalted manhood and His unwearied ministry—His hidden life—His public life—His supernatural asceticism and active benignity—His sweetness—His meekness and His zeal—the winning virtues of His Sacred Humanity—His serene calmness and sublime endurance—His mysterious Priesthood and His awful Passion. In St. Thomas we find more of all the mysteries of the Incarnation embodied and imaged than in most other saints. In his history, childhood may find its happiest innocence, boyhood its beaming joy, youth its bright ideal, and manhood its noblest maturity; the priest, the prelate, and the prince, their grandest perfection; and all made glorious by martyrdom's rare crown. No marvel that for centuries St. Thomas held his hold in the breasts and affections of his countrymen; no wonder that even now, after the lapse of seven centuries, in this very England for which he died, there are some to whom the colours on his heroic portrait are yet bright and grand as ever; and there are some who, amidst the varied scenes he was familiar with, (alas! how altered, since he walked among them!) in the busy city, where some years of his youthful virtue was made manifest—in the crowded Strand, where he received his first preferment*—in the precincts of the Abbey and Hall of Westminster, where he often sat in council, or presided as chancellor, or celebrated sublime pontifical functions as Primate and chief pastor of England, and where is the shrine of the Confessor, for whose good old Christian Saxon laws he was a martyr; or, going from the court and

* The *ancient* church of St. Mary le Strand, of which the site, like that of the *present* church, (if not the same,) is close to Somerset House.

city into the country, amid the green lanes of Hertfordshire, or the lovely Wealds of Kent, under the massive roof of St. Albans, or the ancient cloisters of St. Andrew; in the old minster of Rochester, where he has been received with affectionate veneration by bishop and by chapter, by clergy and by laity, along the beautiful road which leads thence to his own archiepiscopal cathedral, the scene of his consecration and his martyrdom, the place of his shrine:—that road along which thousands of his admiring countrymen have crowded to hail him, their Father and their Defender, champion equally of Church and people; there are some of thy countrymen, illustrious saint,—aye, many in old England who yet honour and love thee; who love to muse on thy heroic image, which seems at times to “haunt us as a passion,” who treasure in their memory the traits which fond affection has preserved of thee; who cherish the feelings of affectionate veneration which honoured thee; and who, amidst the temptations and perturbations of this mortal pilgrimage, cling with passionate eagerness to the faith of their forefathers, who for ages loved thee as the “blessed Thomas,” and, imitating their simple piety, cry to thee with humble fervour, “*Sancte Thoma! ora pro nobis.*”

ART. V.—*The Life, Times, and Contemporaries of Lord Cloncurry.* By WILLIAM JOHN FITZPATRICK, Member of the Royal Dublin Society. Dublin: James Duffy, 1855.

WE took up this book with the intention of skimming lightly over it in half an hour or so, but have been so fascinated that we have read it through from cover to cover with unflagging zest and interest. As a piece of biography, it is well deserving of the reputation it has already acquired. It is, however, something more than a mere biography, and to those who wish to acquire a little knowledge of Irish history for the last seventy years, it presents many attractions, as it supplies, in a pleasant read-

able form, a summary of the leading events in our decline and fall during that period. The writer, without any extravagance of opinion, is rather of the liberal school in politics, and from the fact of his making his literary debut with the biography of such a man as Lord Cloncurry, we entertain hopes that he will become one of that class of politicians whom Ireland so much requires; who with Sidney Smith would shout, not "Erin go bragh," but "Erin get bread and butter—get shoes to your feet and clothes to your back, and a comfortable home to keep the wet and cold out:" and agree with him that the object of all government is,—“Roast mutton, port and claret, a free Church, a clear highway, an honest justice and a stout constable.” These seem to have been the most prominent ideas in Cloncurry’s philosophy, and the propagation of them cannot fail to be productive of good amongst our countrymen. At present, the biographer does not appear to have thoroughly appreciated the real cause of and true remedy for his country’s afflictions.

The first Baron Cloncurry began life as the son of a rich Dublin trader, and succeeding to his father’s fortune and business, and, imitating his industry and diligence, acquired great wealth, and purchased a peerage. Mr. Fitzpatrick goes to a needless amount of trouble to track the genealogy of this trader back to one of the Norman barbarians who came over here with Henry II., and obtained a grant of land near Dublin. We fancy that if Mr. Fitzpatrick had looked into Sharon Turner’s essay on the transcendental merits of those worthies, he would scarcely have laboured so zealously at this grand genealogical tree, and would have been content to take up the history of the house of Lawless from “Pedre ac Nuc,” the grandfather of the first peer, and who seems at least to have been an honest man, of whom no real nobleman need be ashamed. Mr. Fitzpatrick will forgive us for begging of him to study the Irish language before he writes another book in which Irish words are to be introduced. “Pedre ac Nuc,” which he translates as “Peter of the Hills,” was as Sanscrit to us, and so would be to any one for whom he did not translate it; and so is almost every other Irish word introduced into the book. We entertain hopes that he will favour the public with many another volume on Irish affairs; and certainly there can be no more glaring defect than a total cockneyish perversion of Irish words by

an Irishman with an Irish name, writing with Irish feelings on Irish topics.

The Lord Cloncurry, with whose memoirs we have now to deal, was the son of the first baron, and was born in 1773. His father, a prudent man, who wished to keep his son from the perilous paths of Irish liberal politics towards the close of the last century, sent him over to London to study the law. But there the Hon. Mr. Lawless fell into the society of the most zealous rebels, and was committed for safe custody to the Tower. After some months' incarceration he was released, but soon afterwards again replaced in the same uncomfortable quarters, and notwithstanding all the influence of his father and friends, kept there for upwards of two years, without a particle of evidence against him, that would warrant committing his case to the determination of even a packed jury of purveyors to Dublin castle. This imprisonment had a serious effect upon his career. It broke the heart of a young lady to whom he was engaged, and led his father to bequeath £60,000 or £70,000 away from him for fear that he might be attainted and forfeit it. After his release and return to Ireland, he very gallantly and nobly stood by the principles of his youth, always promoted the popular cause, and took an active part in every measure proposed for the amelioration of the social or political condition of the people down to the period of his death in 1853. At one time he vied in popularity with O'Connell himself, and was always before the public in connection with some popular movement or other; and it is said in this volume that if the young Irelanders had succeeded in 1848 in establishing a republic, he would have been the Dupont De L'Eure of the Irish national assembly.

It is obvious that the career of such a man affords ample scope for grouping around it notices of all the most remarkable men and events of the country, for the last seventy or eighty years. The author has done this with great tact and judgment, and combining history and biography, has done more than any recent writer of this class to win the honours due to him—*qui miscuit utile dulci*.

One of the strange characters introduced in these pages is a Mr. John Macnamara, an Irishman and a Catholic :

“Habitually patronized by several members of the government, both in his professional capacity, and in that of ‘gossip agent,’ or

news correspondent. It is amusing to think that, from Lord Cloncurry's nephew, Chief Justice Clonmel, he enjoyed no less a salary than £400 per annum, for merely communicating to his lordship regularly and in detail, the progressive march of political events. By Lord Cloncurry he was paid for services of a similar nature, though not so voluminous, the sum of £100 a-year. Another branch of his profession was that of land agent, which he filled with much credit and emolument under Francis Duke of Bedford. Valentine Lawless, as the son of one of his respected patrons, received some attention from Mr. Macnamara. His residence, situated near Croydon, was a *bonâ fide* liberty-hall, where some of the best London society might daily be seen seated round an ample dinner table, regaling on the good things which no one could provide in better style or in more luxurious plenty than this salaried newsmonger.

“ ‘ Hospitality,
No formality,
All reality,
There you would ever see.’ ”

“ We are assured by Lord Cloncurry in his ‘ Personal Recollections,’ that it was no unusual event for the Prince of Wales to drop in uninvited to these re-unions, as well as men of the highest position in both Houses of Parliament. To think of an Irish Roman Catholic, with the chains of slavery still clanking to his heels, entertaining in those penal days, not only the Royal Heir Apparent, but the Lords and Commons of Parliament, is a phenomenon that will not fail to amaze some readers.”

We had proposed to insert an extract giving an account of the trial and assassination, by due process of law, of William Orr, in 1797, but our space forbids us.

In 1797, some of the most zealous and resolute of the parliamentary leaders of the Irish people adopted the resolution of ceasing to attend in their places in the legislature. This was an ill-advised imitation of the conduct of Fox and his party in England. The difference between the two cases was striking and patent. In England the dominant party in the legislature was English, and acting for English objects, and however wrong in details or means, yet its great goal was the welfare of fatherland. But in Ireland the dominant party was antinational, and seeking to sacrifice the interests and status of the country to those of another country; and the leaders of the Irish parliamentary forces were bound never to surrender, never to give up a post that could be retained, or in any way what-

ever facilitate the subjugation of the people, with the protection of whose interests they were intrusted.

Mr. Fitzpatrick thus sketches their proceedings :—

“On the 10th of May, 1797, took place that celebrated withdrawal or secession from the Commons of all the uncorrupted representatives of the people. Disgusted with the foetid venality of Parliament, and jaded to exhaustion from the effects of a long series of energetic but ineffectual struggles against corruption and state influence, Henry Grattan, Philpot Curran, George Ponsonby, and others, at length consented to the discontinuance of their attendance at the Irish Senate. This they were mainly induced to do at the instance of a deputation, consisting of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, the Hon. Valentine Lawless, and Arthur O'Connor, who gave it as their opinion, that any further visit to the House was nothing but a mischievous mockery, a waste of precious time, and a source of derision to their enemies. A few evenings after, Grattan availed himself of a fitting opportunity to inform the House of Commons generally, of the determination that he and his colleagues had unanimously come to. ‘We have offered you our measure,’ said he—‘you will reject it; we deprecate yours—you will persevere. Having no hopes left to persuade or dissuade, and having discharged our duty, we will trouble you no more, and, after this day, shall not attend the House of Commons.’ (17 *Parl. Deb.* p. 570.) Such was the peroration of Grattan’s memorable speech on Mr. W. Ponsonby’s motion for parliamentary reform—a measure which that gentleman and his colleagues considered the only effectual means of ensuring the restoration of peace and confidence among the people.

“This was the last effort of the popular members to bring forward the golden measure of Reform. An overwhelming and clamorous majority defeated them, and that great question, which whilom received the cordial support of Blackstone, the eloquent approval of Chatham, the helping hand of Flood, and the countenance of Saville, found itself rejected by the House of Commons with a degree of contempt that nothing but a popular motion could succeed in evoking. Upon the dissolution of Parliament a short time subsequent to this event, we find the somewhat questionable policy referred to above still animating the minds of the national party. Amongst those who declined offering themselves as candidates at the new election, were Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Mr. Henry, of Straffan. Singular to say, the addresses of both, on bowing their retirement from the representation of Kildare, were written by Mr. Lawless, who, since the publication of his Anti-Union pamphlet, enjoyed the reputation, amongst his friends, of possessing much fluency in literary composition. Fitzgerald, although a man of vast depth of comprehension, had but an indifferent command of his pen.

“ Subjoined is the noble Geraldine’s address. It does not appear in any published memoir of his lordship; and our efforts to discover it, (so many years having elapsed since the period of its composition) were attended with some delay and difficulty. The principal interest, probably, which the reader of this work will derive from its perusal, is based on the knowledge of the fact that Valentine Lawless wrote it :—

“ ‘ TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTY OF KILDARE.

“ ‘ I take this opportunity of thanking my fellow-citizens for the favour they conferred on me at the last general election. I hope the conduct I have pursued since met with their approbation; it was dictated by the purest motives and most fervent wish for the welfare and happiness of Ireland. I shall not offer myself at present a candidate, feeling that under the present circumstances there can be no free election in Ireland; any return made will be only by *suffrage* of the nearest military commanding officer. What is to be expected from a Parliament returned under *martial law*? Looking to the true spirit of the English Constitution, I doubt if a body elected under such circumstances can be called a Parliament, or its acts reckoned binding. I hope my fellow-citizens of the County Kildare will not look on my declining to stand a candidate now as abandoning their interests. I trust to see the day when I shall offer myself to represent them in a Parliament that will be freely and fairly elected, and *can* be venerated by all honest men.

“ ‘ Though not your representative, believe me always your faithful servant,

“ ‘ *Kildare, July 14, 1797.* ’ ”*

“ ED. FITZGERALD.

As an illustration of the sort of justice administered in what were called the courts of justice at that period, we may notice the case of Captain Frazer, of the Inverness Fensibles. He coming home one evening from a carouse, found an old carpenter, named Dixon, working at his trade in the open air after sunset, in a district that was *not* proclaimed. Frazer and his orderly arrested Dixon, notwithstanding his declarations that the district was not proclaimed, tied him to the crupper of the captain’s horse, and on his attempting to escape at a turnpike gate, pursued and murdered him, inflicting no fewer than sixteen dirk and sabre wounds. A coroner’s inquest charged them with wilful murder. After some defiance of the local authorities he was obliged to submit to the formality of a trial. Mr. Fitzpatrick will tell the rest.

* Cloncurry and his Times, pp. 134-6.

“The trial came off. Many witnesses were examined as to the good and peaceable character of Dixon—his general habits of morality and industry, and complete exemption from all treasonable intents or practices. There were also witnesses upon the other side, who gave a character for all the virtues under heaven, especially the military virtues, to Captain Frazer and his orderly. Amongst them the Rev. Thomas Knipe, a parson magistrate, occupied a prominent position. He knew Captain Frazer long and intimately, and ‘solemnly declared him to be a man of very great humanity.’ Counsellor Antisell asked him if he believed Frazer to have been in liquor? ‘I never saw him so,’ replied the parson, ‘but I certainly heard he was what is generally called hearty.’

“Mr. John Toler, afterwards Lord Norbury, happened to be the presiding Judge of Assize. The facts of the case were soon dealt with, and proved to the satisfaction of everybody; but Toler’s charge to the jury shot a red-hot arrow of indignation through the heart of every friend of poor Dixon or of Ireland. A more extraordinary charge was, probably, never uttered in that or any other court of law. Toler charged home for an acquittal. ‘Gentlemen,’ said he, ‘Captain Frazer is a gallant officer and a stranger, who in his recent ebullition of zeal has merely committed a mistake. If Dixon was as good a man as those witnesses have represented him to be, why it is *deuced* fortunate for him to be out of this wicked world; but if, on the contrary, his political bias was as bad as many others in the neighbourhood (and here he looked very significantly at Lawless, who, in his magisterial capacity, sat beside the judge,) it is undoubtedly well for the country to be rid of him.’ Juries, generally speaking, find a verdict in accordance with the judge’s charge. The captain’s ovation was complete: the jury ACQUITTED him.”—p. 140.

The final close of the career of Lord Clare is a good illustration of moral justice. He was, in fact, the author of the Union, as without him it could not have been carried, and he fancied that once carried a new career of greatness would be opened to him in England. Mr. Fitzpatrick says,

“We are enabled to state, on the most unquestionable authority, that Lord Chancellor Clare was at first averse to a Union. He, however, thought better of it, as the restless plunges of the devil within him—his own demoniac ambition—carried him away. The entire face of Ireland he had long covered with his partisans. Every lord in the House was his automaton. The movements of every official in the Castle were guided by his hand. The Viceroy bowed down before him, and the Commons worshipped him. Deluded by the *ignis fatuus* of his own ambition, he conceived that he might eventually rule the British Councils, as he had contrived to govern

those of Ireland. The Union carried, and a splendid and more expansive field was open to him. 'Let my influence be transferred,' he soliloquised, 'and who knows but I may succeed in placing the King of England beneath my thumb, with as little trouble as I did his representative in Ireland. Stimulated by such reflections, every scruple vanished, and the ambitious Chancellor applied himself, 'tooth and nail,' to the accomplishment of a Union.

" 'If I live,' said Lord Clare, when the measure was brought before the House of Peers, 'if I live to see the Union completed, to my latest hour I shall feel an honourable pride in reflecting on the little share I may have had in contributing to effect it.'

" Had his lordship used the words, 'the torment of a guilty conscience,' instead of '*an honourable pride*,' it would have been nearer the truth. Poor humanity! Wretched, foolish man, whilst he imagined himself weaving the purple garment of wealth and authority, he was, in reality, preparing the winding sheet for his own corpse, his splendour,* and his power. Eager to grasp the scroll and mace of British authority, the Earl of Clare no sooner succeeded in prostrating his country to the earth, than he rushed, with seven league strides, to join the Imperial Parliament. His first appearance there was in the month of February, 1801. He met with nothing but rebuffs. The man who for years knew not what it was to hear the slightest difference of opinion in antagonism to his own, felt himself humbled to the dust by being called to order twice in the course of fifteen minutes.

" We extract the following epitome of the parliamentary proceedings, on this occasion, from the *Dublin Evening Post*, of Feb. 14, 1801. The Irish reader will observe, with disgust and indignation, the but too successful attempts of his lordship to cajole the Roman Catholics out of their expressly stipulated Emancipation:—

" 'Lord Moira condemned the whole of the conduct of Government with regard to Ireland.' * *

" 'Lord Clare declared that there was no country in the world composed of more combustible materials than Ireland, and that the Catholics did not care one jot about Emancipation.' †

" 'As he was proceeding on this subject, he was called to order

* "An idea may be formed of the pomp in which he lived, by the fact of his carriage alone costing £4,000 "

† "The speech, of which this was a summary, abused Ireland and Irishmen violently. Even Mr. Pitt was disgusted with his own utensil's excess of rascality. 'Good G—d,' said he, addressing Mr. Wilberforce, who was standing near him, 'did ever you hear, in all your life, so great a rascal as that?' Mr. Grattan mentions, in the memoirs of his father, that this anecdote was stated by Mr. Wilberforce to Mr. North.

by Lord Suffolk, and the Lord Chancellor admitted that it was proper to call him to order!

"Upon referring to the Parliamentary Register, we find that his lordship was AGAIN CALLED TO ORDER before the lapse of five minutes after Lord Suffolk's interference.

"After a few crest-fallen appearances in the Upper House, Lord Clare, finding the ground rapidly slipping from under him, resolved to make one energetic effort, like the wild and random grasping of a man tumbling down a precipice, to recover the lost position, and bully and browbeat those Saxon peers who twitted him. Actuated by desperation, he made a furious onslaught on the Opposition in the Lords, and insolently stigmatized that respectable body as 'Jacobins' and 'Levelers.' John, Duke of Bedford, started to his feet. 'We would not bear this insult,' said he, 'from an equal, and shall we endure it at the hands of upstart nobility?'

"Dismayed, humiliated, and chagrined, his splendid visions of power and prosperity dashed into atoms of mist, he slunk from the House, and returned to end his days in Ireland, a broken-hearted man.

"Immediately on his return, he found the knocker of his hall-door assailed as usual by hundreds of applicants, craving for place and pension. 'Ah,' said he, as for the first time in his life he began to calculate his influence and found it wanting, 'I that once had all Ireland at my disposal, cannot now nominate the appointment of a single gauger.'

"His already broken heart split into a thousand fragments at this reflection, and on the 28th January, 1802, John Fitzgibbon, Earl of Clare, yielded up his spirit.*

"On his death-bed, he bitterly deplored, to his surrounding relatives, that he should have ever taken hand, act, or part in effecting so ruinous a measure as the Union.

"This fact is given on the authority of his lordship's nephew in Grattan's memoirs, and Dr. Madden stamps it with authenticity, by the statement of having heard it from his lordship's niece."— pp. 249, 251.

The Earl of Clare was not the only tool of Pitt who had cause to regret his own treachery to Ireland. The first baron (Cloncurry) who had been for years the abject fol-

* "Plowden states, that after Lord Clare understood his case to be hopeless, he thought only of devotion, and, three times on the same day, partook of the Sacrament, from the hands of his brother-in-law, the Archbishop of Tuam. As his dissolution approached, the Earl vainly expressed an anxious desire to be attended by a Catholic priest. This was the man who, in 1787, attempted to introduce a Bill for demolishing Catholic chapels!"

lower of the ministry, when his son was in prison, could not obtain even the courtesy of "*an answer, however short,*" (such he expressly begged for) to his applications on behalf of his son—and Lord Clonmel, his nephew, on his death-bed said, "As to myself, if I were to begin life again, I would rather be a chimney-sweeper than a chief justice." So Mr. Charles Phillips writes. Mr. Fitzpatrick throws some doubt on this by stating that the expressions, of which this was one version, were used by Lord Clonmel, some years before his death, in conversation with the late Lord Cloncurry as he was about to go to London. "My dear Val. I have been a fortunate man in life. I am a Chief Justice and an Earl; but, believe me, I would rather be beginning the world as a young sweep." It is odd that Mr. Fitzpatrick, before he contradicted Charles Phillips, did not take time to consider that these words merely indicated a preference for youth with poverty, to old age with wealth and rank, and had no relation whatever to his dealings with the government.

In 1844 Lord Cloncurry stated in the House of Lords that, "the sum of money yearly abstracted from Ireland in absentee rents does not fall short of £6,000,000." He repeatedly urged the reclamation of the waste lands. In 1848, when the Tenant Right Question was brought before the public, he expressed himself in favour of two or three alterations in the details of the arrangements between landlords and tenants, which would no doubt be of great practical importance. These were stated in a letter to Dr. Grattan, of Kildare, from which we take the following extract.

"If a special agreement be made in open court at the time of leasing, as to what should be built, what should be the cost, and how much each party should pay towards it, there could be no after dispute. If neither had the necessary funds, let a third party lend them as a first charge on the farm. I, in general, charged ten per cent. on buildings, and so did my father, and neither of us ever yet had a dispute with one of our tenants. If I give a thirty-one years' lease, I have a right to my land at the expiration of this time. In honesty I should give a preference to the resident tenant if he was an improver, otherwise his good works would be lost to him if I was unjust or embarrassed. It is therefore to prevent the great hardships to tenants, that I think the bargain with all particulars should be made in open court.—'*Coram judice, et vulgi stante corona.*'"

“Suppose you took a farm from me and built kennels and stables on it, the valuers might be years disputing whether I should pay for such useless things or not, but if we agreed beforehand in open court there could be no dispute, whereas, if you build barns and cow-houses without previous agreement, you would offer a premium to a necessitous or dishonest landlord to dispossess you. The tenant should not underlet at an *increased* rent on any account. Such arrangements would, I think, give security to all parties, *which could be greatly facilitated by an arrangement of corn rents, which would enable landlords to give perpetuities without possible injury to their successors.* Of all things, every landlord interfering directly or indirectly with his tenants’ political rights at elections, should be subject to the penalties of *misdemeanour*. It is, however, vain to endeavour to better our condition as long as the great drain of absentees and taxes for imperial purposes continue. We have now mothers eating their own offspring, while there are sixteen millions of grain in the country, and eight million tons of nutritive vegetables, independent of the amount of foreign food. And of 147 paupers in a poorhouse, 142 are from the estates of absentees, and five only from those of residents.”—p. 526.

Biographies seldom run to second editions. The author is, however, sanguine of that result. If he should be so fortunate, and he most certainly deserves success, we should recommend him to bring the book within the reach of a larger class of readers, by reducing its bulk and price. He may well omit the history of those Lawlesses, with whom Lord Cloncurry could claim no kindred, and the details of those military operations or outrages in 1798, with which he had no connection, and may, by way of compensation, fix attention more unmistakably on that which was the prominent characteristic of Lord Cloncurry’s political views, that Ireland cannot enjoy permanent prosperity while the greater portion of its soil belongs to absentees.

- ART. VI.—1. *Mahometanism in its Relation to Prophecy, or an Inquiry into the Prophecies concerning Antichrist, with some reference to their bearing on the events of the present day.* By AMBROSE LISLE PHILLIPPS, Esq., of Grace Dieu Manor, Leicestershire. London: Dolman, 1855.
2. *Apocalyptic Sketches.* By the Rev. Dr. CUMMING. London: Hall and Virtue, 1854.
3. *The Apocalypse fulfilled, or an Answer to Apocalyptic Sketches.* By Dr. CUMMING. By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ, B.D., &c. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman's, 1854.
4. *An Argument for the Neronic date of the Apocalypse, from Internal Evidence.* By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ. London: Walton and Mitchel, 1855.
5. *Lectures on the History of the Turks.* By the author of "Loss and Gain." Dublin: Duffy, 1854.

FEW persons are disposed to feel much interest in speculations upon prophecy, so far as it is understood to bear upon events subsequent to the Atonement. It is not without reason, men feel, that those wonderful events have been wrapped up in language so obscure, and imagery so enigmatical, that a serious attempt to penetrate their meaning would seem the most hopeless enterprise in the world. Other considerations, too, are of a nature to discourage curiosity in those at least who hold sacred Scriptures in that reverent estimation which becomes a Christian, and which is essentially opposed to the saucy and flippant familiarity with inspiration, so common amongst those precisely who handle the subject of prophecy. Can it be that the oracles of Christianity have been intended as a kind of spiritual puzzle, a mere exercise of ingenuity, a target for conjecture, as likely to be reached by random guesses as by the most scientific inquiry, a book not meant to enlighten and guide all ages and nations, but to confound, perplex, and lead them astray, "to find a man mad," as Dr. South says, "or to make him so?" Are we to impute it to a chance omission that the Church, the guardian and expositress of the Sacred Scriptures, has never authentically assigned a meaning to the prophetic passages in question, and are there men so vain as to imagine that any amount of criti-

cal learning, any refinement of critical subtlety, is equal to the elucidation of a single dark passage in prophecy? On the other hand, however, there are few who may not deem it presumptuous to censure studies and speculations which have been thought profitable by the most eminent fathers and doctors of antiquity, as well as by the greatest commentators of modern times. We scarce think it necessary to say how remote from our wish is any such insinuation, or to add that the interest taken in the subject by the Fathers and Doctors generally is past dispute, and very far above our blame or approval. And there is no one who must not admit that the spirit in which these questions have been reviewed by Mr. Phillipps is quite beyond cavil, although we must not conceal that there is part of his theory which we think untenable on principles of merely human criticism, and as to part of which we cannot venture to offer any opinion whatever.

It cannot fail to strike the least attentive observer as a somewhat singular, though perhaps not unnatural result of the system of private interpretation of the Scriptures, that the darkest and most mysterious passages, those which at first sight no one could suppose to embody either the morality or the dogma of a Christian Church, should have been the favourite subject of comment, and consequently the teeming parents of innovation. It was on the ground of her identity with the monsters of prophecy that the reformers justified their departure from the Roman Church, and there have been more dissenting confessions, more Sions, more Bethesdas, more Agapemones and New Jerusalems built out of Daniel and the Apocalypse than out of all the Scriptures besides. The Lord's Prayer, not even excepting "the power and glory clause," could command no such interest as the little horn of the beast, and who would find time for investigating the eight beatitudes that might have a turn at analysing the seven phials? The reasons why this should be so are more numerous than we can afford to enter into now; but darkness and perplexity are always a temptation to adventure; they fascinate and spell-bind the wayfarer upon those paths, if he have any dash of originality; and as experience has proved, the vast variety of analogies supplied by human events, is only equal to the capacity for diverse and opposite interpretations, existing in the Apocalypse and prophecies generally. Hence it is that controversialists and innovators, from Waldo, to Irving

and Joe Smith, having vagabond fancies and unlimited power of exposition, with a free range amongst glosses literal, figurative, allegorical, intelligible and unintelligible, can spell any system, and prop it up with any arguments out of prophecy. It is something painful to contemplate the amount of Protestant learning that has been lost upon the Apocalypse, and the names otherwise respectable that have become ridiculous when connected with that one subject: for commentators, while they have failed to create a Protestant opinion, however sectional, on the matter, have, according to the admission of moderate Protestants, done a great deal to discredit Christianity itself, which not a few insist upon making responsible for every absurdity put forward in its name. The subject is so choked with this tropical luxuriance of opinions, all running into each other, and matting their untrained, unpruned rankness,—that it is even to Protestants themselves, as impenetrable as an Indian thicket, or resembles more, perhaps, an antediluvian swamp, overgrown with vegetation, huge, though rudimentary, and peopled by monsters unhappily not obsolete.

There is another circumstance, too, more observable in the dealing of Protestant commentators with the prophecies than with any other portion of Scripture, and that is the pre-existence in the commentator's mind of the theory to which it is sought to fit the text. Bossuet laid his finger upon the main difference between the Protestant and Catholic systems of interpretation, when he said that a Catholic in examining the sacred text, has no further or higher ambition than to ascertain the meaning with a view to its adoption, simply and unreservedly; when found, however, it may shock his prejudices or wound his pride; whereas it is the object of the Protestant to make it square with preconceived notions, to guide it by an imaginary canon of reason, to bow it down to the pride of his judgment, to contract it to the span of his understanding, to humour it or force it into submission, and then perhaps submit himself to the work of his own hands. Agreeably to this system, every commentator seems to have his theory matured before attempting to fit it into prophecy, and then to set about his task in a determined and workmanlike manner, that will not be trifled with. No difficulties, petty or grave, are allowed to stand in the way. Facts and dates are roughly or delicately handled as circum-

stances may require, but the commentator is determined to do his work, and whether by force or fraud, by wresting the sense or leading it, he must make out his case, and it eventually is made out to his entire satisfaction. Conclusions, the connexity of which with the premises is not always quite apparent, are declared inevitable, microscopic coincidences are magnified and proclaimed indisputable, facts are assumed as demonstrated which we were simple enough to believe still in doubt, and thus if we admit a dozen of the most violent hypotheses, take no liberties with the dates, and overlook a few logical irregularities, we may accept any of the theories, or all of them at once, for they are not more repugnant to, or exclusive of each other, than the materials of each are irreconcilable amongst themselves.

This is a tone of mind which no one who possesses the least acquaintance with Mr. Phillipps's writings, could think of imputing to him; but with all that respect for his great abilities, and varied learning, to which they are eminently entitled, we cannot help observing that in the strength of his own profound convictions, he has too often proceeded upon arbitrary constructions and unsupported assumptions; and that he frequently accepts as undoubted proofs what we are sure he never would have allowed to an adversary, or never would himself have admitted, had he for a moment placed himself in the position of an adversary. Mr. Phillipps's theory, as most of us know, in reference to what has been somewhat loosely called unfulfilled prophecy is, that the Antichrist came in the person of Mahomet; that his reign, however, is to be understood of the duration of his system, that the system is now drawing to a close, and that Russia is the power chosen to effect its destruction. It is perfectly unnecessary to say that Mr. Phillipps brings learning and ingenuity to bear upon his task, and that he has discovered a good many curious analogies between historical personages and the Antichrist. Unfortunately the Antichrist is an anti-type that has only too many types, and we are not to be surprized if we find a surprizing family likeness between them all. But if we could fix upon one particular in which the Antichrist was to be distinguished from all other conquerors and tyrants, it would surely be the fact of his setting himself "above *all* that is called God." This Mr. Phillipps himself admits, and it is in adapting this character

to Mahomet that he appears to fail most signally. Mahomet, in his pretended revelations, asserts a superiority over Jesus Christ, and to that extent certainly sets himself above God ; but can he be said in so doing to set himself above *all* that is called God. This expression of the Apocalypse is not pretended to be figurative, and Mahomet at most only claims to be the prophet of God, as he is understood by the Jews.

Mr. Phillipps, again, though relying upon this assumption of superiority over the Redeemer, in proof of Mahomet setting himself above all that is called God, relies upon another gloss, founded upon the Scripture use of the word Gods as referring to kings and eminent men in general, whereby he is enabled to maintain that Mahomet, having proclaimed himself supreme over all earthly rulers, set himself above all that was called God. Now we think we are warranted in saying this is far from even constructive evidence, to identify Mahomet with the great antagonist of Christ, and we think also we might be entitled to ask Mr. Phillipps on what grounds he considers Mahomet to have believed in the genuineness of his revelations. We had always been accustomed to treat him as an uncommonly clever impostor, but we cannot bring ourselves to look upon him as an enthusiast or a dupe, and to speak of his pretended revelations as actually delusions of the devil, in which Mahomet placed as implicit belief as the most besotted of his followers. The question has been raised of late by his Rationalist biographers, and forms good debateable matter of criticism, but it is hardly competent for Mr. Phillipps to treat it as settled for ever, and conceded by his readers.

The book, notwithstanding, is full of instructive matter and interesting views ; and although we cannot accept the main hypothesis on which they are founded, yet we cordially sympathise with the conclusions to which they lead. At all events they are, to to say the least, more plausible than most of those we meet upon the same subject ; and if Mahomet and his system be not Antichrist and his reign, we have reason to regret it, as they both seem to have nearly run their course. There has been nothing more offensive to ourselves personally than the stupidities that circulated so largely and freely during the present war about our ancient ally, and his rights. Our ancient ally looks upon us as dogs, and would give us, if he could, the dog's usage he has accorded

to his Christian bondsmen. If the question lay between Turkey and Russia merely, we cannot but say Russia would have all our sympathies. Russia, however, is not an abstraction any more than Turkey, and were it not that our own interests, our own civilization, and our own religion are concerned in excluding Russia from Constantinople, no Czar could wish the sick man more quickly out of pain than we, for assuredly if the Turk be not Antichrist he does not deserve to fare much better. Although, on the other hand, if his reign be to terminate, as Mr. Phillipps interprets the prophecy, in the passage we propose to quote, we should be inclined, as a matter of personal taste, to accommodate ourselves with an Antichrist of tolerably subdued temper, abated pretensions and exhausted strength, rather than live under a delivering "King of the North," such as the Emperor of Russia would be likely to prove.

"*'And at the time prefixed,'* says the Holy Ghost by the mouth of Daniel, *'the king of the south shall fight against him.'* Now who is the King of the South? The south is a relative term; what is south of our place may be north of another; when, therefore, the prophet talks of the king of the South, we may refer to a king who should reign over lands to the south of that land where the prophet saw his vision, or he may mean to the south of the country which he immediately afterwards characterises as *'the North'* over which would reign *'the King of the North,'* or to the south of the land over which Antichrist himself should reign.

"Now we must observe that Daniel ushers in this consoling prophecy, by saying, *'at the time prefixed,'* that is the time prefixed for Antichrist's destruction, in other words, towards the latter end of the 1260 years which were prefixed for the continuance of his dominion. At that time the king of the South shall fight against him; that is, a king who shall rule over what is to the south of that other territory, which is characterized in the same prophecy as the dominion of the king of the North.

"Now it is a fact, whatever be the relations between Mahometanism and this prophecy, that we are not far off from the conclusion of the twelve hundred and sixtieth year of Mahometan history. And it is equally a fact, that notwithstanding the disgraceful jealousies of the Christian powers, a kingdom has been created in the South of Europe, the very existence of which is a triumph over Mahometanism—the kingdom of Greece. In Africa, still further south, the French nation have wrested another large territory from the Mahometan dominion, the vast province of Algeria, and no one can doubt that the same noble power threatens the existence of the empire of Morocco.

“What Daniel foresaw, the nineteenth century has accomplished. The king of the South has fought against Mahomet. But it is not in the south alone that Mahomet is to suffer. ‘The king of the north shall come against him like a tempest, with chariots and horsemen, and a great navy, and he shall enter into the countries, and shall destroy, and shall pass through. And he shall enter into the glorious land, and many shall fall, and these only shall be saved out of his hand, Edom and Moab, and the principality of the children of Ammon. And he shall lay his hand upon the lands and the land of Egypt shall not escape, and he shall have power over the treasury of gold and of silver, and all the precious things of Egypt; and he shall pass through Lybia and Ethiopia. And tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him, and he shall come with a great multitude to destroy and slay many. And he shall fix his tabernacle Apadno between the seas, upon a glorious and holy mountain: and he shall come even to the summit thereof, and no man shall aid him.’ ”

“In these remarkable words does the prophet foretell the utter destruction of Mahometanism, and we here find that this great work is to be achieved by a potentate whom Daniel designates as the king of the North.

“It is evident that this prophecy has not yet been accomplished, it still remains to be fulfilled. Its accomplishment may have commenced, but we may not live to see its completion. One great northern potentate, the Russian emperor, has already been at war with the representatives of the false prophet. When Russia conquered the Crimea, and other provinces bordering on the Black Sea, the inroads of the king of the North evidently commenced. The prophecy tells us when they will end,—not until the king of the North is master of the whole Turkish empire, with all its feudal dependencies enumerated in the text. The king of the North will make himself master of all that Turkey reigns over, ‘*save only Edom and Moab, and the principality of the children of Ammon.*’ That portion of the Turkish empire, for some reason decreed by God, will escape the grasp of the northern eagle; but Palestine, and Egypt, and Lybia, and Ethiopia, will witness the power of his victorious troops. His course, however, will not be one of uninterrupted victory: ‘tidings out of the East and out of the North’ are to trouble him, his armies may sustain a temporary check from Asiatic tribes on the one hand, or the more northern portion of his dominions may receive a shock from the successful aggression of hostile powers, jealous of his increasing empire. But the prophet warns us that the fate of Mahometanism is sealed. ‘The king of the North shall come with a great multitude to destroy and slay many. And he shall fix his tabernacle Apadno between the seas, upon a glorious and holy mountain, and he shall come even to the summit thereof, and no man shall help him.’ Such, if it may be permitted to express an intimate conviction of the meaning of prophecy, is

the wonderful destiny of this great northern potentate. I hazard no prediction of my own ; I fix no dates, but no man can arrest the onward course of time, or gainsay the decrees of the Almighty." — "*Mahometanism in its Relation to Prophecy*," 197—201.

Such is the exposition of prophecy furnished to us by Mr. Phillipps, but by way of a corrective, we have a far different fate reserved for the Russians by Dr. Cumming, and the author of "*The Coming Struggle*." His views are noticed at some length by the Rev. Mr. Desprez, who supports his own view with considerable ability and learning, and for a protestant, having such a subject in hand, is entitled to be considered a rational and temperate, not less than a well informed writer. Indeed his work is intended as a refutation of Dr. Cumming's "*Apocalyptic Sketches*," and though the labour is somewhat superfluous, we are glad to see he does not deal too seriously with Dr. Cumming. To handle the "*Apocalyptic Sketches*" in that style would be to break a fly upon the wheel, when you might flap the insect at once, if you were to notice it at all. Mr. Desprez does neither, but like uncle Toby with the memorable blue-bottle fly, catches it deliberately, confines it for a moment, lifts the sash, and with a few kind and pleasant words, dismisses it gently to buz over the wide world that is large enough to hold them both. The "*Journal of Sacred Literature*," we are glad to see, represents a rather sound state of Protestant opinion upon those matters, and takes a similar view of the strange publications with which the present diseased appetite for religious excitement is constantly supplied. "Unhealthy action," says that periodical, "leads to counteraction both in physics and morals, and by the law of nature some degree of healthfulness is maintained in both spheres. But in the latter there is danger of going to extremes, and while avoiding a morbid and sluggish state of things, to run into wildness and excess. In no department is that so likely to take place as in that to which the work before us (Mr. Desprez's book) refers, since in no other, probably, has such egregious folly been committed. This would be bad enough if such theories rested on mere opinion, but unfortunately they are based by those who give utterance to them on the word of God. There is reason to fear that thousands of persons are deluded into the idea that they are being edified, and advanced in their Christian career,

who are listening to mere fables ; and those whom the certainty of death and judgment cannot rouse to religious zeal, are quickened into an artificial life (like a corpse subjected to voltaic action) by expositions of the Apocalypse. Mr. Desprez has been aroused by this unhealthy state of things to pour contempt on apocalyptic conjectures and endeavour to establish a theory, which if true, must dissipate them at once. As a tangible object of attack, he has chosen to break a lance with Dr. Cumming, and perhaps in all the circumstances, he could have done no better. That popular divine has uttered as many crudities both on the Revelations and other parts of Scripture, as any one man ever did, and yet continues (doubtless on that account) to enjoy popular favour. We confess we should not like to waste many pages to expose Dr. Cumming's fallacies, because we think them far below any serious critical notice, and we could only be led to such a course in the hope of enlightening the public mind to his doctrinal and interpretative errors. But Mr. Desprez has thought differently, and attacks his selected opponent with an energy which makes us wish he had a more weighty adversary." For our part, we think Mr. Desprez has exercised a very sound discretion ; for contemptible as Dr. Cumming's fancies may appear to us, we have evidence that they find favour with a large class of what is called the serious public, and after all, Mr. Desprez has not dignified them with too solemn a refutation, as the following extract from his work will show.

" ' The last streamlet is barely discernible in the once full and overflowing channel of the great Euphrates. *The shadows of Russia and Britain are at this moment by a stormy combination spread over it, to prevent its entire evaporation.*' I need not say that Dr. Cumming, like all expositors of unfulfilled prophecy, has here got out of his depth altogether. Russia is using strange means to prevent the evaporation of Turkey. The general impression is that she would gladly have dried up the streams of the Euphrates, if by so doing she could have transferred the seat of government from St. Petersburg to Constantinople ; and when he speaks of *Russia and Britain uniting* to effect this purpose, he must surely have had a glance into Sir Hamilton Seymour's despatches before the government of this country had had time to reject the proposal of the ' division of the sick man's property.'

" ' The three unclean spirits, like frogs,' are Infidelity, Popery, and Tractarianism ; though what Tractarianism [an unclean spirit

of so diminutive a size] has to do with the evaporation of the Turkish empire, seems none of the clearest. They are said to be like frogs, because France will be the chief supporter of Popery, and the ancient national arms of France was said not to be the tri-colour, but three frogs.

“Of the ‘battle of the great day of God Almighty, when the kings of the earth and of the whole world are gathered together in a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon,’ I can find no account, but I subjoin one taken from a pamphlet called ‘The Coming Struggle,’ the authorship of which I should be sorry to lay at Dr. Cumming’s door, although in some measure his views prepare the way for such extraordinary rhapsodies.

“‘All is ready. That awful pause which takes place before the shock of battle, reigns around; but ere it is broken by the clash of meeting arms, and while yet the contending parties are at a little distance from each other, a strange sound is heard overhead. The time for the visible manifestation of God’s vengeance has arrived; his fury has come up in his face, and he calls for a sword against Gog throughout all the mountains. ’Tis the voice of the Lord that breaks the solemn stillness, and startles the assembled hosts. The scene that follows baffles description. Amid earthquakes and showers of fire, the bewildered and maddened armies of the Autocrat rush sword in hand against each other, while the Israelites and their Anglo-Saxon friends gaze on the spectacle with amazement and consternation. It does not appear that they will even lift their hand against that foe which they had come so far to meet. Their aid is not necessary to accomplish the destruction of the union. The stone cut without hands shall fall upon its feet, and break them to pieces, and then shall the clay, the brass, the iron, the silver, and the gold, become like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, and the wind shall carry them away. The various descriptions which we have of this battle all intimate that God is the only foe that shall contend with the Autocrat at Armageddon. John terms it ‘the battle of that great day of God Almighty,’ and we believe the principal instrument of their defeat will be mutual slaughter. The carnage will be dreadful. Out of all the millions that came like a cloud upon the land of Israel, only a scattered and shattered remnant will return; the great mass will be left to cleanse the land, and fill the valley of Hammongog with graves.’

“I believe all this is to take place in about fifteen years.

“Mr. Elliot holds out the same threat. ‘The important bearing of the true apocalyptic date, on apocalyptical interpretation, will soon appear.’ If men of learning and sense will hold such views, we cannot wonder at the hallucinations of the book of Mormon, and of Joe Smith. We cannot wonder at the sanguinary contest of Armageddon, as described in the above-mentioned pamphlet. It seems to show that when once men have entered into a subject with previously formed notions, nothing is too strange or

out of the way to be brought into the channel of their own imaginations. No absurdities too great to be reconciled—no difficulties too severe to be overcome. I cite this description of the battle of Armageddon as an instance of the power which views like these might exercise in turning men to infidelity and atheism.”—“*The Apocalypse Fulfilled*,” pp. 193—196.

It will be readily inferred from this passage that Mr. Desprez is not much more tender of Dr. Cumming when there is question of Rome than when he has to deal with Turkey, and accordingly though naturally attached to the latitude of interpretation allowed by Protestantism, and though he says that Romanists have not much to boast of in the uniformity of their exposition, since it is purchased at the sacrifice of the most valuable privileges, he has good sense sufficient to see that Protestantism has nothing to expect, and Rome nothing to dread, from commentators like Dr. Cumming. One thing is plain, whatever else may be doubtful or obscure, that the cherished principle of free interpretation involves the other Protestant privilege of bringing the Scriptures into contempt by such shocking inanities as those of Dr. Cumming and his fellows, combining, as they do, the drivelling of thorough folly with the malevolence of perverted reason. We remember to have heard it decided, “after solemn debate, upon the nature of the case and reasons offered,” that Napoleon III. was actually *not* the Apollyon of prophecy, although the decision might have been otherwise but for the N with which the imperial name inconveniently begins. Yet what Protestant is entitled to say that the supporter of the affirmative had not, after prayerful meditation, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, rightly decided that Napoleon ought to be Apoleon, and thence by an easy transition fall into Apollyon; and that he himself may not, under the same guidance, have arrived at an opposite conclusion, with an assurance equally positive? Surely it is a very real abdication of the functions of reason to wedge yourself into a dilemma which prevents you from *peremptorily* rejecting any nonsense, however inconceivable, provided its parent appeals to his right of private judgment. We shall now see what Mr. Desprez thinks of the anti-Roman theory.

“In pursuing our examination of the subject of the open book, I shall first briefly give the opinions of those from whom I differ; and I hesitate not to say that any interpretation will be better

than that laid down by Mr. Elliot and Dr. Cumming. I give, as nearly as I can, the substance of their interpretations, leaving out, as matter wholly unconnected with the point in question, the history of Martin Luther, which occupies about fifty pages of Dr. Cumming's book.

“The ‘mighty angel coming down from heaven,’ is the angel of the covenant, the Son of God, ‘clothed with a cloud,’ as the symbol of Deity; the ‘rainbow upon his head,’ the recognized symbol of his eternal covenant, ‘his face as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire,’ emblematical of divine power and majesty; the descent of this angel, the reformation in the sixteenth century; ‘the open book,’ the Bible, unclasped by Luther, ‘his right foot on the land and his left foot on the sea,’ *the Pope* with one foot on the land and the other on the sea, the gigantic usurper claiming the whole world as his dominion; ‘the cry as when a lion roareth,’ *the roaring of Pope Leo X. against Luther!!!* ‘the seven thunders,’ *the thunders of the Vatican*, the command to ‘seal up the seven thunders and write them not,’ the command to Luther to despise the thunders of the Vatican; the intention of St. John, ‘I was about to write,’ the difficulty in Luther's mind about disobeying the authority of the Church of Rome; the voice from heaven, ‘Seal up the things which the seven thunders uttered and write them not,’ the command of God prevailing in Luther's mind above the command of the Pope, so that while Rome said ‘write the thunders,’ the voice from heaven said ‘write them not,’—care not for the anathema of man, but for the benediction of God. The angel's oath, ‘There should be time no longer, but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared unto his servants the prophets,’ the general belief prevalent at the time of the Reformation, that the millenium was about to begin; the declaration that the book which St. John was commanded to eat should, ‘make his belly bitter, but should be in his mouth sweet as honey,’ that Luther's preaching should be bitter in his experience but sweet in the issue; and the charge, ‘Thou must prophecy again before many people, and nations, and tongues, and kings,’ the revival of preaching which had grown obsolete at the time of the Reformation.

“Under the sad and painful conviction that I may fail equally with those whose views I condemn, I must be forgiven if, in the midst of sacred things, I cannot resist a smile at this most marvellous exposition.

“The mighty angel is one moment the Lord Jesus Christ, the next moment he is metamorphosed into Pope Leo X. I presume that one great point of resemblance must be, that Pope *Leo* would naturally roar as a *lion*; the original is ὡς περ λέων μυκᾶται, the word is used of the lowing of a *bull* or an ox. Upon such a system of interpretation, this ought to be positive evidence that *the Papal Bull* must be intended. He comes down from heaven with all the

insignia of Deity, 'clothed with a cloud and a rainbow upon his head,' when, lo! a magic wand of theological interpretation touches him, and he is immediately changed into the territory-grasping Pope.

"We have seen many ridiculous and absurd expositions of this book as we have gone along; we have seen 'fire' out of horses' mouths converted into cannon; 'tails of scorpions' into Turkish standards; seals indicative of terror and despair into seasons of triumph and prosperity; half-an-hour into seventy-five years; five months into one hundred and fifty years; and an hour, a day, a month, and a year, into three hundred and ninety-six years one hundred and six days, during the whole of which precise period men 'repented not of their murders, of their sorceries, of their fornications, nor of their thefts.' We have seen surprising liberties taken with chronology, and seals, and trumpets, and vials defined to a hair's breadth; we have jumped into the sixteenth century at one bold leap, although the prophecy is one of the things which must shortly come to pass, and thanks to Merle D'Aubigné, we have a very beautiful and concise abridgment of the history of the Reformation.

"But somehow or another I cannot get over this roaring of Pope Leo X. against Luther, and this metamorphose of the seven thunders into the thunders of the Vatican.

"Happy those who can give credit to such marvellous expositions; happy those to whom their great oracle may propose, without risk of gainsaying, the change of the mighty angel into Pope Leo X., and the thunders of his mighty voice into the thunders of the Vatican. They will have no difficulty in believing that the increased 'sale of piano fortes is an earnest of the preparation for millennial harmony;' they will see no serious obstacle to the progressive steps of chronological interpretation, by which we are to arrive at millennial perfection in the year 1855.

"I regret to say this is not the case with minds of a different order. Unfounded assertions like these are the cause of much of the prevailing infidelity of the day; men of common sense and common judgment see at a glance the absurdities of such views, and they recoil from truth because of the fool's mantle which is occasionally wrapped round it."—*The Apocalypse Fulfilled*, pp. 217-220.

We had ourselves intended to notice one or two of the more salient absurdities of this class of expositors, but Mr. Desprez has taken the business out of our hands, and dealt with it in a serio-comic vein exactly appropriate to the matter, and which we could not hope to equal. In truth, although Catholic theologians have been obliged as a dry piece of duty to notice these mad theories, when they had more simple and trusting believers than at

present, none have been more active in the work of demolition than Protestant writers themselves; some of whom felt the inconvenience, and, we are bound to admit, scrupled the dishonesty of such a line of argument. They came to perceive it could hardly be possible that a Church, "some of whose bishops, in this and the last age," to use the words of Burnet, "were burning and shining lights," could represent the reign of Antichrist, that the Pope, whose virtues in one instance at least, that of Innocent XII., were acknowledged by the same Burnet, could be the man of sin foretold by St. Paul. It struck them as somewhat singular that the monster of pride should strike his breast every day, and confess before angels and men that he had sinned grievously in thought, word, and deed; or that he who set himself above all that is called God should write himself "the servant of the servants of God." Dr. Todd, in his very learned lectures upon the Apocalypse, speaks upon this subject with a manliness and candour which do him great honour. "The labours and learning," he says, "of our Protestant theologians have been expended in the vain attempt to reduce a large and mysterious branch of prophecy to a preconceived interpretation, the offspring of controversial rancour and polemical debate. The sacred text has been handled in the belligerent spirit that counts all artifices lawful, all means of victory justifiable and right. Historical facts have been misrepresented, and the words of Scripture irreverently explained away." It is not long since a distinguished judge said, "Common sense yet lingers in Westminster Hall;" and we for our parts are glad to see that common sense is somewhat getting the better of private interpretation. Certainly not before it was time. Can there be anything more painfully ridiculous than Bishop Newton's explanation of the assumption into heaven of the witnesses after their death? The witnesses, of course, represent the persecuted Protestants. "And they shall be raised again by a voice from heaven, that is, by *public authority*; and they shall ascend into heaven, *that is*, they shall again be admitted to civil honours and offices of the state." It is the story of the soul of the Licentiate Pedro Garcia over again. Two poor scholars on their way to Salamanca met with a tombstone, as every reader of Gil Blas knows, on which was the inscription, "Here lieth the soul of the Licentiate Pedro Garcia." The less acute of the two was disposed

to look upon the inscription as a bull, and nothing more, whereas his shrewder companion, rightly conceiving there was a mystery in the words, delved for the Licentiate's soul, and turned up a well-filled purse. What else is this heaven of Bishop Newton and his Protestant witnesses? But we should be wrong to throw the entire responsibility of this interpretation upon Bishop Newton, for it belongs to an entire school. And surely under all the circumstances nothing need astonish us from such a quarter, especially when we bear in mind that the men who formed, and the men who adopted such opinions, if opinions they can be called, were men of integrity, learning, and even genius. As it is, few Protestants can venture to contradict these theories without an apologetic and propitiatory tribute to Protestant feeling, in the shape of some as ungracious sneer at the Roman Church as can well be compounded, lest any one should suspect the staunchness of their Protestantism. But this we can afford to forgive in consideration of the good service that must be done to the cause of common charity as well as common sense by the destruction of such wicked absurdities.

All the while we have not noticed Mr. Desprez's theory. He maintains, and with equal ingenuity and learning, that the Apocalypse was written in the reign of Nero, and had reference to the destruction of Jerusalem. To establish this he does not rely on the support afforded him by the Syriac version, which declares the Apocalypse to have been written at Rome, whither John was banished by Nero the Cæsar, nor yet upon the passage of Tertulian, which seems to make the banishment of John synchronise with the martyrdom of Peter and Paul at Rome. Nor does he consider that Eusebius, who borrows from St. Irenæus, or the other supporters of the Domitianic date, can be refuted by evidence external to the Apocalypse itself. His idea is, that the Apocalypse supplies internal evidence of the date of its composition, and of its being pointed at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Apocalypse, he says, speaks of Jerusalem as still existing, and, moreover, all the woes denounced against the worshippers of the beast, and the inhabitants of the region subject to the rule of Antichrist must fall, if we are to be governed by the ordinary acceptation and uniform employment of the Scripture phrase, upon the Jewish people,

while the great Babylon herself can be no other than the deicide city of Jerusalem. Considerable uniformity must always prevail in the treatment of these subjects, so that we shall not enter into all the analogies existing, or made out to exist, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the prophetic woes. The main line of argument, however, if we rightly apprehend it, may be traced in a very few words. The Apocalyptic prophecies have reference to a single nation and a single city, and that being once conceded or proved, the Jewish people is plainly pointed at in the inspired text, and the great Babylon may easily be identified with Jerusalem. As might be supposed, the horrors detailed by Josephus, in his history of the siege, are sufficiently various and intensified to correspond with any prediction in the Apocalypse or elsewhere; but independently of these analogies, be they fanciful or be they real, Mr. Desprez seeks to support his view by verbal criticism, and, as it strikes us, with great fairness and considerable plausibility. As one instance we might refer to his reading of the word $\gamma\eta$ in contradistinction to the $\text{o}\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ or $\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\theta\nu\acute{\eta}$ of Scripture. $\Gamma\eta$ as understood by Mr. Desprez, when used with any qualifying or limiting terms, has reference to some particular land, and when used in opposition to the $\epsilon\theta\nu\acute{\eta}$ is always restricted to the Jewish people. In the Apocalypse these qualifications, and the opposition mentioned, are constantly recurring, so that Mr. Desprez considers himself warranted in referring the expressions when so used, and that is almost invariably, to Judea. We, for our part, should be very glad to examine Mr. Desprez's theories somewhat in detail, not that we have the slightest leaning to his system, but because it is modestly and moderately, as well as ably urged. We must, however, take leave of it for the present, with a willing expression of our gratification at the style in which the author has treated the reveries of Dr. Cumming, who has been forced into such sudden and unwholesome growth by the double agency of the Queen's visit, if we are not mistaken, to his tabernacle in Scotland, and the papal aggression frenzy in England.

Of Dr. Newman's lectures on the Turks, we have only to say we have read them with unmingled satisfaction. He makes no attempt to connect them with prophecy. What he writes is pure history, so simple, so genuine, and so faithworthy, that although it traces the origin of the Turks

into the night of fable, it never loses itself or parts company with you. But to return for a moment to Mr. Phillipps,—in the establishment of his theory, he undertakes amongst other things to show that the name of Mahomet, whether spelled as in Arabic, or in the Byzantine Greek of the time, is made up of the mystic 666, which has been such a standing puzzle for the commentators. For one of these explanations, according to which MYHAMMEA B'N ABΔAΛAΔH represents the number of Antichrist, it appears Mr. Phillipps is indebted to M. l'Abbé Vandrival, but with every deference to so respectable an authority, it seems very doubtful whether the digits signified by the letters of any name, and taken without reference to their order, could be understood to indicate the supposed number, and supposing they could, it is pure assumption that the number must be brought out in such a way. Again, a style of computation which would fit so many names cannot be intrinsically valuable, even if the inquiry were worth much in itself. Might not the least embarrassing supposition be the literal adoption by the Antichrist of some cabalistic number, from an imputed virtue or efficacy, such as it is thought was attributed to numbers by Pythagoras? or perhaps a less embarrassing course still, would be to leave the question to Bishop Newton, Mr. Meade, or Dr. Cumming, and allow them to make much of it.

There is another conjecture of Mr. Phillipps, which we cannot but regard as still more fanciful and still more untenable. Every one is familiar with the text of the prophecy which says that the Antichrist, if it be to him Daniel refers, shall *worship the God Maozim*, “And who is so blind,” says Mr. Phillipps, “as not to see further in this remarkable word, whether the ‘Maozim’ of the Septuagint, or the ‘Mahuzzim’ of the Hebrew, a still more remarkable and wonderful coincidence between it and the name of the false prophet? Write it *Mahomet*, *Mohammed*, or *Mahommed*, it cannot fail to remind us of *Maozim* and *Mahuzzem*. And if we would pursue such coincidences a little further, we may find an equally striking one between the Maozim and Mahuzzim of the prophet, and the Muezzim of the Mahometan Mosques.” We must confess that conjectures like these appear to us to have nothing but their fanciful ingenuity to recommend them; and without adopting or rejecting what Mr. Phillipps

has put forward on the whole subject, without presuming to make light of his undeniable learning, great talents, and estimable character, we submit whether such a proof as this can possibly advance his position, or whether it is more reasonable to identify the God Mahuzzim with the Muezzim or Crier of the mosque, than it would be to confound the object of worship in our churches with the church beadle.

But it will be asked, what then? Are the prophecies to exist only for the enemy? Is the Church to abandon the guardianship of that sublime portion of her inheritance to the stranger, and when she is charged with being herself the great apostacy, is her defence, in the mouth of her children, to be limited to a dry denial? Surely not. In the absence of authoritative decision upon her part, the opinions of the Fathers and Doctors, from Irenæus to Bossuet, are entitled to that respect which Catholics alone know how to yield to them. On the question of the apostacy precisely, their opinions were widely different. The Greek Fathers, who, in common with the Latin, considered the Antichrist a person, and not an empire or a system, regarded the apostacy as identical with Antichrist. *Αὐτὸν καλεῖ τον τὸν Ἀντίχριστον ἀποστασίαν.* “In speaking of the Apostasy,” says St. John Chrysostom, “he alludes to the individual Antichrist. (Hom. iii. 12. Thess. Tom. xi. p. 525.)” Theodoret uses nearly the same words *Ἀποστασίαν αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσε τὸν ἀντίχριστον.* Theophylactus again says, “The coming of Christ will not take place unless the apostacy shall have happened, which apostacy is the Antichrist, *οὐ γενήσεται φησιν ἡ παρουσία του Χριστου εἰ μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία, τουτ’ ἐστιν ὁ Ἀντίχριστος.*” Tertullian and St. Jerome, on the other hand, refer it to the disruption of the Roman empire, and so on from question to question, the opinion of those venerable men only one degree removed from inspiration, and interesting, if for no other reason, than that they are the opinions of such men, are open to the student of prophecy. But to venture beyond such study, and set up our rival theories, is a thing hardly to be recommended. It may not be meet for us to know whether the prophecies have been accomplished, or remain unfulfilled. Their great obscurity, and the silence of the Church, are two arguments that it was never intended they should be easily interpreted. The Saviour, while giving us to understand there should be a second coming,

had no desire to embarrass us with wordy controversies and vain speculations upon the millenium. We might rather suppose it His intent to put us upon our guard by the knowledge of an impending judgment, such as that revealed in the Apocalypse, without giving us to know the hour of His visitation, or affording us means of discovering it. Were it otherwise, such knowledge as we might gain would almost seem to defeat His own purpose, and render useless the warning that the Son of Man would come like a thief in the night, though it is not pretended the warning had reference to the reign of Antichrist. Still we submit, in all humility, that even though the prophecies should have had their fulfilment, it may not be within the designs of Providence that our uncertainty should be removed; but so far, at least as we are able to calculate the result of human industry in the exposition of prophecy, we think we may say with St. Augustine, “Ego prorsus quid dixeret fateor me ignorare.”

ART. VII.—*Sisters of Charity Catholic and Protestant, Abroad and at Home.* By Mrs. JAMESON. London: Longman, 1855.

THERE are few subjects more worthy of the deep consideration of the philanthropist as well as of the statesman, than that to which Mrs. Jameson has called our attention in this little work. The census of 1851 shows the excess of the female above the male population in Great Britain alone to be more than half a million. Consequently, if all the males were to take wives, (which is very far from being the case,) there would still remain 500,000 females who cannot be provided with husbands. The destructive and desolating war in which Europe is at present engaged, must still more increase the disproportion. Some persons have sought a remedy for this state of things in emigration, but the device is at once degrading and ineffectual. Delicacy and genuine shrinking modesty are the

great charms of the female character. Charter a ship, proclaim it abroad through a neighbourhood that she is bound for a land where men are plenty, and famine, or poverty, or the order of the poor law guardians, or the hope of escaping the workhouse prison, will soon crowd her deck with a motley assemblage which has been gathered together by destitution, and not unfrequently by crime. We do not mean to assert that such a congregation may not contain many virtuous modest females; we admit that emigration is often the best chance of reformation which is offered to the profligate; but we cannot forget the revelations that reach the public from time to time regarding emigrant ships—revelations of impurity too horrible to be written.

With regard to an educated and refined woman, her instinctive delicacy will prevent her from entertaining for a moment the idea of emigrating to look for a husband. Such a person may accompany a father or a brother to a foreign land; but these instances are so few as scarcely to deserve to be mentioned, for they do not diminish in any considerable degree the six or seven hundred thousand women who cannot be provided for at home. Moreover, the man who proposes for a woman may not be acceptable to her, and it is surely infinitely better for her to remain single than to marry a man whom she cannot hope to love. There are also many persons whose bodily infirmities, although unknown to the world, render them unfit for the married state. Perhaps we would not be much beyond the mark if we were to estimate the total number of women in the British dominions alone who must remain unmarried, at a little less than a million. Notwithstanding the number of girls who have been sent out to Australia, the excess of females above males is increasing instead of diminishing, and this proves that the remedy is not to be sought in emigration.

Although educated ladies, at all events such of them as unite with this, any degree, however small, of feminine delicacy, are unwilling to proclaim their readiness to travel to the antipodes in search of a husband, yet it is painful to be obliged to confess that their entire minds seem to be engrossed from their tender years with the one, almost the sole, thought of marriage. About this the most innocent, and in other respects most guiltless girl thinks it no degradation to scheme and plot in a manner which would not disgrace a veteran diplomatist. Of this she reads, thinks,

talks with those of her own sex, and no doubt dreams of it also, so that marriage is the alpha and omega, the beginning and end of her existence. If she misses a respectable marriage, she loses the whole end and object of her being, she sinks down into a peevish querulous old maid, and the world blames her for being that which it has made her; cynical and discontented, unhappy herself and the cause of unhappiness to others. "Old maid" is perhaps the most comprehensive, as it is certainly the most unjust term of reproach in the language. It conveys the idea of youth wasted in vain, of the hopes of an entire life being blighted, of a sour, selfish, and to the last degree unamiable "old thing," who hates all mankind and vents her spiteful envy on every blooming girl, whom she backbites because she is about to be led to that very hymeneal altar which she so long sought in vain, and which she now declares, though not one person in the whole wide world will believe her, that she always abhorred.

In a vast number of cases it is not at all the inclinations of the individual, but the tone and temper of society which has caused this diseased desire of matrimony. It is impossible for any person to shut his eyes to the fact that in the Catholic Church, thousands of girls in the bloom of youth and beauty, in the very spring-time of hope, voluntarily choose a life of celibacy. It is no answer to this living and palpable fact to quote old stories about girls having been forced into religious houses by selfish parents. No doubt there were abuses in this as well as in other admirable institutions. Their existence is proved by the stringent laws made against them in the Council of Trent. But an abuse does not prove that an institution should be abolished,—if it did matrimony itself should have ceased at a very early period of the world's history. Do parents never force their children into wedlock? In the present times, and as far at least as the British Islands are concerned, girls are often forced into matrimony, but never into a convent. In fact, it is generally only by long and earnest entreaty, by appealing to their religious feelings as well as to their affection and tenderness for herself, that a young and amiable girl is enabled to overcome the opposition of her parents, and to induce them to permit her to consecrate her virginity to God in the beloved seclusion of the cloister. It is the tyrannous scorn with which the world everywhere treats the "old maid," that causes the

girl to regard marriage as the only aim of her existence, and which often (though by no means always,) makes her in case she is obliged to remain single, the sour and envious creature which she is represented. Once let it become the established feeling of society, that a virtuous and benevolent single lady deserves to be as much respected as a matron,—let a single life be regarded as a state which a lady may select in preference to marriage,—let society feel and act as if not only the devoted daughter and the affectionate sister, may remain single, but that the sweet enthusiastic philanthropist also, may desire to remain unfettered by the dear domestic ties of husband or child, in order to give her undivided heart to God, and to devote her whole life to the duties of sisterly love towards those who have no nearer claim upon her than that they have been made in the image of God, and that they have no relation to aid them, or care for them upon earth. Let it be established that the highest aim of woman is not to get a husband, but to serve God ; that the first and greatest commandment given to her is not to marry, but to love her heavenly Father ; that the second is not to get a help-mate whom she may cherish, but to extend her charity to all God's creatures ; that God may have given her a heart so large, a zeal so overflowing, a benevolence so expansive, that she feels herself called to devote all her energies to the service of the poor, the friendless, and the afflicted, and God will be glorified, society benefitted, and many a noble nature now sunk in despondency and in darkness, will, like the sun-flower, when it feels the genial beams of the morning, turn towards its God and open into renewed vigour and loveliness.

The anomalous and very frequently unhappy position in which women are placed by the diseased tone of society in their regard, is truly and exquisitely portrayed in the soliloquy of the young girl in “*Shirley*,” which is quoted by Mrs. Jameson, (pp. 12-18.) We can only make room for a part of it.

“ ‘Old maids,’ soliloquises the young girl, ‘like the houseless and unemployed poor, should not ask for a place and an occupation in the world ; the demand disturbs the happy and rich ; it disturbs parents. Look at the numerous families of girls in this neighbourhood—the Armitages, the Birtwhistles, the Sykes. The brothers of these girls are every one in business, or in professions ; they have something to do ; their sisters have no earthly employ-

ment but household work and sewing; no earthly pleasure but an unprofitable visiting; and no hope in all this life to come of anything better. This stagnant state of things makes them decline in health; they are never well, and their minds and views shrink to wondrous narrowness. The great wish, the *sole aim of every one of them* is to be married, but *the majority* will never marry: they will die as they now live. *They scheme, they plot, they dress to ensnare husbands.* The gentlemen turn them into ridicule; *they don't want them; they hold them very cheap*; they say,—I have heard them say it with sneering laughs many a time—the *matrimonial market is overstocked*. Fathers say so likewise, and are angry with their daughters when they observe their manœuvres; they order them to stay at home. What do they expect them to do at home? If you ask, they would answer—sew and cook. They expect them to do this, and this only, contentedly, regularly, uncomplainingly, all their lives long, as if they had no germs of faculties for anything else;—a doctrine as reasonable to hold as it would be that the fathers have no faculties but for eating what their daughters cook, or for wearing what they sew. Could men live so themselves? Would they not be very weary? Men of England! look at your poor girls, many of them fading around you, dropping off in consumption or decline; or what is worse, degenerating to sour old maids,—envious, backbiting, wretched, because life is a desert to them; or, what is worst of all, reduced to strive, by *scarce modest coquetry and debasing artifice*, to gain that position and consideration by marriage, which to *celibacy* is denied. Fathers! cannot you alter these things? Perhaps not all at once; but consider the matter well when it is brought before you; receive it as a *theme* worthy of thought; do not dismiss it with an idle jest, or an unmanly insult. You would wish to be proud of your daughters, and not to blush for them. Then seek for them an occupation which shall raise them above *the flirt, the manœuverer, the mischief-making tale-bearer.*”

This is “the problem,” Mrs. Jameson truly observes, “which it is given to us in this age and this country to solve as well as we can; to solve, I will say it, or perish morally.” She declares that this problem has been *partially* solved by another church, and the qualification is true according to her conceptions; because, with all her superior intelligence and affectionate disposition, she does not thoroughly understand the spirit which animates the Catholic Church. She is aware that many well-meaning, ignorant people, in this country, entertain the idea that the existence of communities of women, trained and organised to help in social work from the sentiment of devotion, is especially a Roman Catholic institution, belonging peculiarly to that Church, and necessarily im-

plying the existence of nuns and nunneries, veils and nuns, forced celibacy and seclusion, and all the other inventions and traditions, which, in this Protestant nation, are regarded with terror, disgust, and derision. "The truth," she says, "seems to me to amount to this : that the Roman Catholic Church has had the good sense to turn to account and assimilate to itself, and inform with its own peculiar doctrines, a deep-rooted principle in our human nature,—a law of life, which we Protestants have had the folly to repudiate. We admire and reverence the beautiful old cathedrals which our Roman Catholic ancestors built and endowed. If we have not inherited them, we have at least appropriated them and made them ours ; we worship God in them, we say our prayers in them after our own hearts. Can we not also appropriate and turn to account some of the institutions they have left us ? What prevents us from using sisters of charity as well as fine old cathedrals and colleges, for pious ends, and as a means of social benefit ? Are we as stern, as narrow-minded, as deficient in real, loving faith, as were our puritanical forefathers, when they not only defaced and desecrated, but would gladly, if they could, have levelled to the earth and utterly annihilated those monuments of human genius and human devotion ? Luckily they stand in their beauty, to elevate the minds and hearts of us, the descendants of those who built and dedicated them, and who boast that we have reformed not destroyed the Church of Christ !—and let me say that these institutions of female charity to which I have referred,—institutions which had their source in the deep heart of humanity, and in the *teaching of a religion of love*,—let me say that these are better, and more beneficial, and more durable than edifices of stone reared by men's hands, and worthy to be preserved and turned to pious uses, though we can well dispense with some of those ornaments and appendages which speak to us no more."

Mrs. Jameson proceeds to give a very hasty sketch of the associations of women who were united under the direction of the Catholic Church in works of social good. "That these women," she says, "should have been early associated with the Church, and held their duties by ecclesiastical appointment, was natural and necessary, because all moral sway, and all moral influence, and all education, and every peaceful and elevating pursuit, belonged, for many centuries, to the ecclesiastical order

only. The singular and beneficent power exercised by the religious and charitable women in those times is remarked by all writers, though none of them refer it to a natural law—a great first cause. The whole of the early history of Christianity is full of examples.” After quoting as an example the history of Paula, a noble Roman lady, a lineal descendant of the Scipios and the Gracchi, she proceeds: “This picture, drawn fifteen hundred years ago, so quaintly graphic, and yet so touching in its simplicity, will, perhaps, bring before the mind’s eye of those who listen to me, scenes of the same kind, scenes now enacting in the far, far East, where female ministry has been called upon to do like offices of mercy;—to wash the wounds and smooth the couch, and ‘lay the pillow aright,’ of the maimed, the war-broken, the plague-stricken soldier. But we must for awhile turn back to the past. It is in the seventh century that we find these communities of charitable women first mentioned under a particular appellation. We read in history, that when Landry, bishop of Paris, about the year 650, founded an hospital, since known as the Hotel Dieu, as a general refuge for disease and misery, he placed it under the direction of the *Hospitalières*, or nursing sisters of that time.” They were united, by Innocent IV., under the rule of the Augustine Order. The novitiate and training was of twelve years duration, after which she was allowed to make her profession. Several hospitals which were served by the *Sœur Hospitalière* were expressly founded for the reception of the sick pilgrims and wounded soldiers returning from the East, and bringing with them strange and hitherto unknown forms of disease and suffering. “Some of the largest hospitals in France and the Netherlands originated in this purpose, and were all served by the *Hospitalières*; and to this day, the Hotel Dieu, with its one thousand beds, and that of *La Pitie*, with its six hundred beds, are served by the same sisterhood, under whose care they were originally placed centuries ago. For about five hundred years the institution of the Dames or *Sœurs Hospitalières* remained the only one of its kind. During this period it had greatly increased its numbers, and extended all through western Christendom; still it did not suffice for the wants of the age; and the thirteenth century, fruitful in all those results which a combination of wide-spread suffering and religious ferment naturally produces, saw the rise of another

community of compassionate women destined to exercise a far wider influence. These were the Sœurs Grises, or Grey Sisters, so called at first, from the original colour of their dress. Their origin was this:—the Franciscans (and other regular orders) admitted into their community a third or secular class, who did not seclude themselves in cloisters, who took no vows of celibacy, but were simply bound to submit to certain rules and regulations, and united together in works of charity, devoting themselves to visiting the sick in the hospitals, or at their own homes and doing good wherever and whenever called upon. Women of all classes were enrolled in this sisterhood. Queens, princesses, ladies of rank, wives of burghers, as well as poor widows and maidens. The higher class and the *married women occasionally served; the widows and unmarried devoted themselves almost entirely* to the duties of nursing the sick in the hospitals. Gradually it became a vocation apart, and a novitiate or training of from one to three years was required to fit them for their profession.”

The Beguines seem to have existed as Hospital sisters, in the seventh century, and to have settled in communities at Liège and elsewhere in 1173. “They wear a particular dress, (the black gown, and white hood,) but take no vows, and may leave the community at any time,—a thing which rarely happens. No one who has visited Ghent, Bruges, Brussels, or indeed any of the Netherlandish towns, will forget the singular appearance of these, sometimes young and handsome, but always staid, respectable-looking women, walking about protected by the universal reverence of the people, and busied in their compassionate vocation. In their few moments of leisure the Beguines are allowed to make lace and cultivate flowers, and they act under *a strict* self-constituted government, maintained by strict traditional forms. All the hospitals in Flanders are served by these Beguines. They have besides attached to the houses of their own communities, hospitals of their own, with a medical staff of physicians and surgeons, under whose direction, in all cases of difficulty, the sisters administer relief, and of the humanity, skill and tenderness with which they do administer it, I have never heard but one opinion; nor did I ever meet with any one who had travelled in those countries who did not wish that some system of the kind could be

transferred to England." Speaking of their hospital at Bruges, which had been praised long ago by the benevolent Howard, a recent traveller says: "Its attendants, in their religious costume, and with their nuns' head-dresses, moving about with a quiet tenderness and solicitude, worthy their name as 'Sisters of Charity;' and the lofty wards, with the white linen of the beds, present in many particulars an example of the most accurate neatness and cleanliness." "In the fifteenth century, (about 1443,) when Flanders was under the dominion of the Dukes of Burgundy, a few of the Beguines were summoned from Bruges to Beaune to take charge of the great hospital founded there by Molliere, the Chancellor of Philip the Good. They were joined by others from the neighbouring districts, and this community of nurses obtained the name of *Sœurs de Ste. Marthe*, sisters of St. Martha. It is worth notice that Martha, who is represented in Scripture as troubled about household cares, while her sister Mary 'sat at the feet of Jesus, and heard his words,' was early chosen as the patroness of those who, instead of devoting themselves to a cloistered life of prayer and contemplation, were bound by a religious obligation to active secular duties. The hospital of Beaune, one of the most extensive and best managed in France, is still served by these sisters. Many hospitals in the south of France, and three at Paris, are served by the same community."

In Germany the Sisters of Charity are styled "Sisters of St. Elizabeth," in honour of the sweet enthusiast, whose pathetic story and beautiful legend poets and painters have alike contributed to adorn. At Vienna, a few years ago, Mrs. Jameson visited one of their houses, with an hospital of fifty beds attached to it. The number of patients received during the year amounted to four hundred and fifty. "Nothing could exceed the propriety, order, and cleanliness of the whole establishment. On the ground floor was an extensive 'Pharmacie,' a sort of Apothecaries' Hall; part of this was divided off by a long table or counter, and surrounded by shelves filled with drugs, much like an apothecary's shop; behind the counter two sisters, with their sleeves tucked up, were busy weighing and compounding medicines, with such a delicacy, neatness, and exactitude as women use in these matters. On the outside of this counter, seated on benches or standing, were a number of sick and infirm, pale, dirty, ragged

patients; and among them moved two other sisters, speaking to each individually in a low gentle voice, and with a quiet authority of manner, that in itself had something tranquillising. Howard, in describing the principal hospital at Lyons, which he praises for its excellent and kindly management, as being 'so clean and so quiet,' tells us that at that time (1776) he found it attended by nine physicians and surgeons, and managed by twelve Sisters of Charity. 'There were sisters who made up, as well as administered, all the medicines prescribed, for which purpose there was a laboratory and apothecary's shop, the neatest and most elegantly fitted up that can be conceived.''' He adds, that the hospitals belonging to the Sisters of Charity in all countries, were the best regulated, the cleanest, the most tenderly served and managed of all he had met with. It was in one of their hospitals he first observed iron bedsteads.

"While the men," says Mrs. Jameson, "who professed the healing art were generally astrologers and alchymists, dealing in charms and nativities, lost in dreams of the Elixir Vitæ and the Philosopher's Stone, and in such mummeries and quackeries as made them favourite subjects for comedy and satire,—these simple sisters in their hospitals, were accumulating a vast fund of practical and traditional knowledge in the treatment of disease, and the uses of various remedies." Still in the course of several centuries abuses had crept into these institutions, which were composed of such various ingredients and spread over so many countries; "though from a deep-rooted principle of vitality and necessity they seem to have escaped the vicissitudes of time, for they did not change in character or purpose, still less perish." Yet in some instances the funds were misappropriated, in others the novices were not well trained, and in many there was a falling off from primitive fervour and devotion to their calling. A reform was required, and it was brought about very effectually about the middle of the seventeenth century. "Louise de Marillac, better known as Madame Legras, when left a widow in the prime of life, could find no better refuge from sorrow than in active duties, undertaken for the love of God. She desired to join the Hospitalières, and was met at the outset by difficulties which would have extinguished a less ardent vocation, a less determined will. She set herself to remedy the evils instead of shrinking from them.

She was assisted and encouraged in her good work by a man endued with great ability and piety, enthusiasm equal, and moral influence even superior, to her own. This was the famous Vincent de Paul, who had been occupied for years with a scheme to reform thoroughly the prisons and the hospitals of France. In Madame Legras he found a most efficient coadjutor. With her charitable impulses and religious enthusiasm she united qualities not always, not often, found in union with them—a calm and patient temperament, and that administrative faculty, indispensable in those who are called to such privileged work. She was particularly distinguished by a power of selecting and preparing the instruments, and combining the means, through which she was to carry out her admirable purpose. With Vincent de Paul and Madame Legras was associated another person, Madame Gaussant, who besieged the Archbishop of Paris, till what was refused to reason was granted to importunity, and they were permitted to introduce various improvements into the administration of the hospitals. Vincent de Paul and Louise Legras succeeded at last in constituting, not on a new, but on a renovated basis, the order of Hospitalières, since known as the Sisterhood of Charity. A lower class of sisters were trained to act under the direction of the more intelligent and educated women. Within twenty years this new community had two hundred houses and hospitals; in a few years more it had spread over all Europe. Madame Legras died in 1660. Already before her death the women prepared and trained under her instructions, and under the direction of Vincent de Paul, had proved their efficiency on some extraordinary occasions. In the campaigns of 1652 and 1658, they were sent to the field of battle, in groups of two and four together, to assist the wounded. They were invited into the besieged towns to take care of the military hospitals. They were particularly conspicuous at the siege of Dunkirk, and in the military hospitals of Anne of Austria, at Fontainebleau. When the plague broke out in Poland, in 1672, they were sent to direct the hospitals at Warsaw, and to take charge of the orphans, and were thus introduced into eastern Europe; and, stranger than all, they were even sent to the prison infirmaries, where the branded *forçats* and condemned felons lay cursing and writhing in their fetters. This was a mission for Sisters of Charity

which may startle the refined, or confined, notions of Englishwomen in the nineteenth century. It is not, I believe, generally known in this country that the same experiment has been lately tried, and with success, in the prisons of Piedmont, where the sisters were first employed to nurse the wretched criminals perishing with disease and despair; afterwards, and during convalescence, to read to them, to teach them to read and to knit, and in some cases to sing. The hardest of these wretches had probably some remembrance of a mother's voice and look thus recalled, or he could at least feel gratitude for sympathy from a purer higher nature. As an element of reformation, I might almost say regeneration, this use of the feminine influence has been found efficient when all other means had failed." Even in the middle of the last century Howard observed that the vast superiority of the French prisons over those of England was to be attributed to the kind offices which these religious ladies performed towards the felons.

At the commencement of the great French Revolution, the Sisterhood of Charity had four hundred and twenty-six houses in France, and many in other countries. The whole number of sisters actively employed was about six thousand. During the Reign of Terror, the superior, (Malle. Duleau,) who had become a Sister of Charity at the age of nineteen, and was now sixty, endeavoured to keep the society together, although suppressed by the government, and as soon as the Consular government was established the society was recalled by an edict, which commences as follows:—

"Seeing that the services rendered to the sick can only be properly administered by those *whose vocation it is, and who do it in the spirit of love*, seeing, farther, that among the hospitals of the Republic those are *in all ways best served*, wherein the female attendants have adhered to the noble example of their predecessors, whose *only object was to practise a boundless love and charity*; seeing that the members still existing of this society are now growing old, so that there is reason to fear that *an order which is a glory to the country*, may shortly become extinct:—it is decreed that the Citoyenne Duleau, formerly superior of the sisters of charity, is authorized to educate girls for the care of the hospitals, &c."

"I confess," Mrs. Jameson adds, "I should like to see an act of our parliament beginning with such a preamble."

“ Previous to the Revolution, the chief military hospitals at Brest, St. Malo, and Cherbourg, had been placed under the management of the Sisters of Charity. During the Reign of Terror those sisters who refused to quit their habit and religious bond were expelled, but as soon as order was restored they were recalled by the naval and military authorities, and returned to their respective hospitals, where their reappearance was hailed with rejoicing and even with tears. At present the naval hospitals at Toulon and Marseilles, in addition to those I have mentioned, are served by these women. The whole number of women included in these charitable orders was, in the year 1848, at least twelve thousand. They seem to have a quite marvellous ubiquity. I have myself met with them not only at Paris, Vienna, Milan, Turin, Genoa, but at Montreal, Quebec, and Detroit; on the confines of civilization; in Ireland, where cholera and famine were raging, everywhere, from the uniform dress and a certain similarity in the placid expression and quiet deportment, looking so like each other, that they seemed, wherever I met them, to be but a multiplication of one and the same person.”

Another order has arisen in the Catholic Church within the last few years—I mean the Sisters of Mercy—which has spread with as wonderful rapidity as that of the Sisters of Charity. Their first house was established in Dublin, under the auspices of the late Archbishop, the Most Reverend Dr. Murray, in 1831. The foundress, Mrs. M'Auly, served her noviciate, and was professed in the Presentation Order. Within a few years the houses of the Sisters of Mercy have not only been wonderfully multiplied in these countries, but have even been established in Australia and America, where this sisterhood have already many foundations. The objects of the Sisters of Mercy are the same as those of the Sisters of Charity. Wherever a work of mercy is to be done, there are they to be found, like “ministering angels”—in the crowded hospital where pestilence reigns, in the felon's cell, in the squalid cabin by the bed-side of the destitute and the despairing, bringing relief to the body and consolation to the mind, in the lunatic asylum amongst hideous gibbering maniacs, like messengers sent by God to show that even they are not forgotten by their heavenly Father,—in the school, amid the young and the innocent, teaching them, more

powerfully by their example than by their words the beauty of virtue and the deformity of vice, to love God with their whole hearts, and their neighbour as themselves. They are ministers raised up by God to show how He loves His creatures, and wherever His charity reaches, there are they not afraid or ashamed to penetrate. Yet, will it be believed that at this very time, when their devotion to the wounded soldiers, at the seat of war, is extorting the admiration even of those who were at first opposed to their mission of love, when the rough warriors amongst whom they move, exclaim on beholding them, "now we know that our country cares for us;"—the fell spirit of bigotry is so rampant, that the doors of the gaol and the workhouse have in many places been shut against them? An outcry was even raised when a hospital in Dublin was lately entrusted to the care of the Sisters of Mercy. And yet, already in a few weeks, the place is entirely changed. Order and cleanliness have succeeded confusion and squalor, and the quiet gentle sympathy of a lady, long trained in the practice of compassionate kindness, whose only motive is the love of God and of her afflicted brethren, is certainly a great improvement upon the common-place attention and mercenary kindness of even the best hired nurse. But, hired nurses are very often brutal and unfeeling to the last degree. Mrs. Gamp and Mrs. Prig are types of a large number of those who follow this calling, and who are so hardened by the constant sight of misery that they treat the afflicted with irritation and violence, instead of tenderness and compassion.

It is admitted on all sides, Mrs. Jameson says, "that the general management of our hospitals and charitable institutions exhibit the want of female aid, such as exists in the hospitals abroad,—the want of a moral, religious, intelligent, sympathizing influence, combined with the physical cares of a common nurse. Some inquiry was made into the general character of hospital nurses, and the qualifications desired; and what were these qualifications? Obedience, presence of mind, cheerfulness, sobriety, patience, forbearance, judgment, kindness of heart, a light delicate hand, a gentle voice, a quick eye;—these were the qualities enumerated, as not merely desirable, but necessary, in a good and efficient nurse—a long list of virtues not easily to be purchased for £14. 10s. a year!—qualifications, indeed, which, in their union, would form

an admirable woman in any class of life, and fit her for any sphere of duty, from the highest to the lowest. In general, however, the requirements of our medical men are much more limited; they consider themselves *fortunate if they ensure obedience and sobriety, even without education, tenderness, intelligence, religious feeling, or any high principle of duty.* On the whole the testimony brought before us is *sickening. Drunkenness, profligacy, violence of temper, horribly coarse and brutal language,*—these are common. We know that there are admirable exceptions. Still, the reverse of the picture is more generally true. The toil is great, the duties disgusting, the pecuniary remuneration small in comparison; so that there is nothing to invite the co-operation of a better class of women, but the highest motives which can influence a true Christian. At one moment the selfishness and irritability of the sufferers require a strong control; at another time their dejection and bodily weakness requires the utmost tenderness, sympathy, and judgment. To rebuke the self-righteous, to bind up the broken-hearted, to strengthen, to comfort the feeble, to drop the words of peace into the disturbed or softened mind just at the right moment;—there are few nurses who could be entrusted with such a charge, or be brought to regard it as a part of their duty.”

It was such considerations as these that induced Mrs. Jameson to sigh for the publication, by our government, of an edict similar to that by which the consular government of France recalled the Sisters of Charity. Yet, with strange inconsistency she considers it inexpedient to introduce communities whose members should be bound by the obligations of chastity, poverty, and obedience. However, she proves by the most unanswerable arguments that without these very obligations, no societies devoted to objects of charity and mercy can be established with the slightest hope that they will be either useful or permanent. She proves that they must not be mere voluntary associations of individuals, each of whom shall be quite independent of the others, but that they must be regularly associated bodies, acting under control, and subject to strict discipline.

“We have,” she observes, “works of love and mercy for the best of our women to do in our prisons and hospitals, our reformatory schools, and I will add our work-

houses ; but then we must have them such as we want them,—not impelled by transient feelings, but by deep abiding motives, not amateur *ladies* of charity, but brave women, whose vocation is fixed, and whose faculties of every kind have been trained and disciplined to their work under competent instruction from men, and tested by a long probation. It will be said, perhaps, that when you thus train a woman's instinctive feelings of piety and tenderness for a particular purpose, to act under control and in concert with others, you take away their spontaneousness, their grace, even in some sort their sincerity ; consequently their power to work good. This is like the reasoning of my Uncle Toby, who, in describing the Bèguines, says, ' They visit and take care of the sick by profession ; but I had rather, for my own part, that they did it out of good nature.' Would Uncle Toby have admitted the necessary inference—namely, that when you train and discipline a man to be a soldier, to serve in the ranks, and obey orders under pain of being shot, you take away his valour, his manly strength, his power to use his weapon ? We know it is not so. Never yet did the sense of duty diminish the force of one generous impulse in man or woman !—that sublimest of bonds, when in harmony with our true instincts, intensifies while it directs them. There is in this country a sort of scrupulousness about interfering with the individual will, which renders it peculiarly difficult to make numbers work together unless disciplined as you would discipline a regiment. The obvious want of discipline and organisation in our civil service, has been a source of difficulties, and even of fatal mistakes in the commencement of this war. In any community of reasonable beings, therefore in any community of women, as of men, there must be gradations of capacity, and difference of work. To make or require vows of obedience is objectionable ; yet we know that the voluntary nurses who went to the east were *called upon to do what comes to the same thing—to sign an engagement to obey implicitly a controlling and administrative power—or the whole undertaking must have fallen to the ground.*'

The manifest truth is that no community can exist without a power of government, which essentially consists in the *right* of some to command, and the *duty* of others to obey. When this duty is promised to the governing power of a body associated for the glory of God, it is what

Catholics call the *vow of obedience*. The promise of obedience Mrs. Jameson proves to be absolutely necessary, and it certainly cannot render it objectionable, to promise it from the motive of the love of God.

In fact, the only successful Protestant establishment for training charitable nurses is an exact counterpart of the Catholic convents of Charity and Mercy. This establishment was founded at Kaiserworth, on the Rhine, in 1836. "The chief purpose of this hospital is to serve as a training school for nursing sisters. Every one who offers herself, (and there is no want of offers,) is taken on trial for six months, during which she must pay for her board and wears no distinctive dress." This is exactly the space required for probation in Catholic convents, and the terms are also the same. "If she persists in her vocation and is accepted, she undergoes a further probation (like the novitiate of the Roman Catholic sisters) of from one to three years. She then puts on the *hospital dress*, and is boarded and lodged gratis. As no inducement is offered to these Protestant sisters any more than in the Catholic orders, no prospect of pecuniary reward, or praise, or reputation, nothing, in short, but the opportunity of working for the sake of God and humanity, so if this does not appear sufficient for them, they are dismissed. After they *have been accepted and made their profession*, they receive yearly a small sum for clothing, (the hospital uniform,) and nothing more; they can receive no fee or reward from those they serve, but in age or illness the parent institution is bound to receive and provide for them. A certain number of these sisters obtain a particular education to fit them for parish visitors. The absolute necessity that women should be especially trained in order to make good and efficient parish visitors is apparent; for it is wonderfully and often pathetically absurd to see with what a large stock of goodness and conscientious anxiety, and what a small stock of experience, knowledge, and sympathy with their objects, some excellent women set off on their task as lady visitors of the poor. Let me add, for it is a matter of interest at present, that Miss Florence Nightingale went through a regular course of training at Kaiserworth, before she took charge of the Female Sanitarium in London."

We have here the probation, the novitiate, and the profession, as in Catholic convents. The professed are bound to obedience, poverty, and chastity, to tend the sick, and

to visit and instruct the poor, like the Catholic Sisters of Mercy. Let these things be promised to God for His honour, and they are religious vows. It may be said that those who make these promises are not bound never to leave the establishment, and that consequently they might go back to society and marry. Suppose Miss Nightingale should marry, would she not compromise the whole work for which she has laboured so long and so well—would she not draw down upon herself a world of ridicule, and destroy all faith in such Protestant associations, so that no one could again for a quarter of a century attempt to speak respectfully of them in England? Why is so long a probation required before any one is professed at Kaiserworth, except that by becoming thoroughly acquainted with their dispositions, their steadiness of purpose and fitness for their work, the society should have a reasonable expectation that they would not desert it? If the nurses occasionally wound up their attendance by marrying the officers or soldiers, who would any longer have faith in the perfect purity of their previous intercourse? If the obligation of celibacy were not clearly understood, the wretched angling for husbands, to prevent which is one of the chief objects for which Mrs. Jameson wishes to see these Houses of Mercy established, would soon be carried on by the nurses as zealously as by their sisters in society.

But suppose Mrs. Jameson had succeeded in establishing such societies, she would have attained but a very small part of her object. Of the 500,000 superfluous women, she only calculates on the one hundredth part, that is five thousand, being willing to join "the communion of labour under a directing power." What is to be done with the remaining four hundred and ninety-five thousand? No one will affirm that they are bound, under pain of damnation, to become hospital nurses, or parish visitors of the poor. A vast number—hundreds of thousands of them—may be utterly unfit for these laborious duties. Has the loving Father above left them no remedy but to become "sour envious old maids?" If they do not feel themselves able or called to devote their lives to works of mercy for His sake, may they not still consecrate their being to His service and His love? May they not choose the better part, and like Mary remain at His feet, meditating on His blessed words all the day long? To say that such pious

ladies are idle and useless, is the miserable cant of persons who scarcely ever think of God, whose lives are spent in idleness, selfishness, or crime. Which is a girl better employed in, laying snares for a husband, or praying to her heavenly Father? Let those who please, and who can accomplish it without sin, marry; let those who feel themselves called to a life of charitable labour for His sake, embrace it with joy, and let those also who wish to converse with God in the seclusion of the cloister, be at liberty to do so. This will at once accomplish Mrs. Jameson's object, and it will establish this great principle, that a lady may remain unmarried from choice, and that the state of virginity which St. Paul embraced, counselled, and pronounced to be more blessed, (1. Cor. vii.), will no longer be regarded as opprobrious.

Another cant is that they should stay in the world and work. Pray, what kind of work are they to do? They cannot get husbands, they are not bound to dig in the fields, or to turn dry nurses, and there are plenty to sew without them. What work is performed by those single ladies who hate the cloister? They work gew-gaws, angle for husbands, and read novels when young, and when old they nurse dogs, play cards, and backbite their neighbours. In the convent there is work of a different kind, for obedience is a work, prayer is a work, and a severe work if it be properly performed; to control their passions and to fulfil God's law, is a work which few perform as they ought. Those who are bound by secular ties, and who have family or social duties to perform, must discharge them, but those who have no such ties or duties, may surely give themselves up body and soul to God. There are enough to work for the world, to be solicitous about the morrow, to toil and sweat for the rewards which the world offers, surely a few may be spared to show the rest that the great end for which all are brought into the world is to honour and to love Him.

ART. VIII.—1. *Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Management and Government of the College of Maynooth. Part I. Report and Appendix. Dublin, 1855.*

2. *Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Management and Government of the College of Maynooth. Part II. Minutes of Evidence. Dublin, 1855.*

FREDERICK SCHLEGEL, in one of those grotesque fancies which he occasionally loved to indulge, somewhere describes a historian as “a prophet with his face turned backward.” It would have needed all the inspired penetration of a prophet to anticipate what the historian will have to record as the history of Maynooth College during the last ten years. Few, we will venture to say, of those who witnessed the memorable Maynooth Debates of the House of Commons, in 1845,—few who remember the magnanimous professions, whether of policy or of justice, in which the opposite sides of the House vied with each other during its progress, and the calm, and in many cases selfsacrificing magnanimity with which the clamour out of doors was ignored or defied,—would recognize the same legislature in many of the phases through which it has since been condemned to pass. It was hard, indeed, in those days of sunshine, to foresee that a few brief years would suffice to reverse all this pleasing promise; to re-establish sectarian acrimony in the position from which it seemed to have been driven for ever; and to reduce the British senator once again to the humiliating condition of the serf of a fanaticism which his heart despised, or of the puppet of a bigotry at which his soul revolted. Yet all these, and stranger things than these, have since come to pass.

By his scheme for the enlarged endowment of Maynooth College from the Consolidated Fund, Sir Robert Peel proposed to attain two ends,—first, to place the education of the Irish Priesthood on a permanent as well as an improved basis; and secondly, by withdrawing the grant for that purpose from the ordeal of annual discussion in the Committee of Supply, to put an end for ever to the acrimonious and insulting denunciations of the Catholic Reli-

gion, by which the annual debate had hitherto been invariably accompanied, and which could not fail to exasperate those religious discontents of Catholics, which it was the main purpose of the dotation to neutralize or to allay.

For the former of these two objects the Act of 1845 contained ample and satisfactory provision. But for the second it was utterly ineffective. When the time for the annual vote upon the Estimates returned, the friends and supporters of the measure had the mortification to discover that, in spite of the wise and statesmanlike intentions of its framer, the wretched scenes of former years were still doomed to be perpetuated as before, and with all their traditional acrimony!

For unhappily, the Act of 1845 contains a provision which, although conceived in the friendliest spirit, has had the result of bringing the whole principle of endowment for Catholic purposes, year after year, under the discussion of Parliament, just as effectively as though the entire grant had been permitted to remain upon the Estimates, instead of being charged on the Consolidated Fund.

By the 9th Section of that Act the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland "are constituted commissioners for purchasing, renting, or providing, any houses, lands, tenements, or hereditaments that may be necessary for the said college, and the purposes aforesaid, and for erecting thereon suitable and necessary buildings and improvements, and for enlarging, improving, upholding, maintaining, repairing, fitting up, and furnishing, from time to time the said college, and the buildings and the premises occupied therewith." Now, the charge thus imposed upon the Commissioners of Public Works, like all the other expenditure of their office, forms an item in their annual Estimate submitted to the Committee of Supply, and, as such, necessarily falls, year after year, under the ordeal of a vote of the House of Commons. And hence, by one of those anomalies with which our system or its details abound, while the main body of the endowment is effectually withdrawn from all incidental discussion, and can only be revoked by a formal act of both branches of the legislature affirmed by the royal sanction, the irritating and offensive issues which it was the great object of the framers of the new Act to settle once for all, may still be raised, with equal facility and perhaps in a more captious and insidious form, upon the subordinate vote

which is annually taken on the petty item of the repairs and maintenance of the material buildings and halls occupied by the inmates of the college! The thing, it is true, appears utterly incredible. That any legislature composed of rational beings could sustain the main endowment and yet throw out the paltry detail;—that they could continue to grant twenty-six thousand pounds a year for the education and support of the rising priesthood of Ireland, and still withhold the paltry sum required to maintain the very decencies of their lodging;—that they could consent to remunerate liberally the staff of deans and professors, by whom these dreaded priests are trained, and refuse the petty wages of the carpenter or mason who may be needed to repair the damages of wind and weather;—that they could pay for the actual teaching of the hated doctrines of Popery, and yet refuse to replace a broken pane in the halls where they are taught;—all this is so ludicrously absurd, so grotesquely inconsistent, that it seems impossible to be believed of any reasonable assembly. Yet such has been, in downright literal truth, the import of the votes of the House of Commons for the last three years, and such is it to the present hour! It is an exaggerated form of that absurdity which, during the Maynooth Debate of 1845, Mr. Macaulay exposed with all his characteristic humour in those who, whilst they were willing to continue the existing miserable endowment of the college, objected strenuously to the increase proposed by Sir Robert Peel. “I cannot,” said Mr. Macaulay, with that good humoured but caustic irony in which he excels, “understand those gentlemen, who say they have no objection to a Catholic establishment, provided it is shabby; to support those who are to teach the Catholic religion, provided only they shall cost something less than the pay of a common infantry soldier; who have no objection to board them, provided only the allowance is so small that they must break up the studies before the time, for mere want of provisions; who have no objection to lodge them, provided only they are packed like pigs in a sty, exposed to wind and rain.” Mr. Macaulay put it to the House in 1845, whether “it was possible to conceive anything more frivolous and absurd.” Had he been present at the votes of several successive years since 1845, he would have witnessed a still greater refinement of absurdity. He would have seen the House, while it con-

tinued to maintain a grant for the men, refuse it for the stone and mortar ; he would have seen them maintain the “ turbulent ” students and “ Jesuitical ” professors in comfortable independence, yet, withdraw their support from the unoffending building in which they are lodged ; he would have seen thousands lavished upon that which alone can be said to involve the principle for which the bigot contends, and units refused for a purpose which need not imply the compromise of a single principle !

The Maynooth question has for years occupied a very large share of the public attention. The discussions regarding it have at length been brought to a close, or at least have assumed a new phase, by the publication of the Report of the Royal Commission of Inquiry ; and the appearance of this very remarkable document seems to afford a suitable occasion on which to enter into a full consideration, as well of the present position of the question, as of the general interests which it involves. The publication of the Report has afforded many topics for discussion, both among Protestants and among Catholics. Many of the latter class are of a nature which it would clearly be inexpedient, in a Journal like ours, addressed to Protestants as well as to Catholics, to discuss formally and in all their bearings. It would evidently be out of place to introduce into these pages, controversies regarding details of the teaching or the discipline of the college which concern Catholics alone, discussions as to the system of general spiritual training, or the special means employed to create or develop the ecclesiastical spirit among the students. These are subjects, which, however important they are in themselves, and however vital in the eyes of Catholics are the interests which they involve, yet must be regulated by principles and considerations on which there is so little in common between Catholics and Protestants, that any attempt to discuss them in common would necessarily prove either uninteresting to one class of readers, or unintelligible to both. And although the evidence of many of the witnesses contains upon all these heads abundant and grave matter for consideration, and suggests various schemes of improvement or reform, yet, important as they are, we prefer to leave them to the discussion of Catholics among themselves, and especially to that of the Trustees of the College, and of the ecclesiastical authorities, who are directly charged with the govern-

ment of the institution. Our present concern with the subject, therefore, is chiefly in its bearing upon the general rights of the Catholic body ; upon their social and political position, whether in relation to the state or to their fellow-subjects of other religious denominations ; and upon the popular prejudices of which they and their religious principles are the object, and of which the hostility to the Maynooth Endowment, though nominally directed against the college, is nothing more than an organized embodiment.

And first it may be amusing and perhaps instructive, to trace the successive steps by which the change in the views of Parliament towards Maynooth has been brought about.

The opponents of the endowment were not slow to perceive the opportunity for renewing their opposition, which was afforded by the oversight committed by the framers of the Act of 1845. But as the repairs of the college during the years 1845-6, were provided for out of the sum of £30,000 granted by the 10th Section of the Act, it was not until the Session of 1848 that the occasion arose. In the Committee of Supply, (August 14th of that year,) a sum of £2,685 (which was meant to cover the expenditure of the two preceding years, the vote having been accidentally omitted in 1847,) appeared among the items of the Estimate of the Board of Public Works in Ireland. It is hardly necessary to say that the eye which detected the lurking abomination, was the ever wakeful orb of the member for North Warwickshire. He was supported in his motion against the vote by thirty-eight of his most consistent followers ; but the amendment was lost upon a division, by a majority of seventy-one.

In the following year, June 1, 1849, Mr. Spooner, with twenty-seven supporters, again resisted a vote of £1,226 proposed for the same purpose : but he was again defeated by almost the same majority as in 1848 ; the numbers being, for the vote 96 ; against 27 ; majority, 69.

On the 27th May, 1850, from some unexplained cause, the command of the anti-Maynooth party was relinquished by Mr. Spooner to the gallant member for Lincolnshire. But although he succeeded in rallying a somewhat greater force than his predecessor, (being supported by forty-seven members,) the vote (£1,240, 10 0) was again carried by a

still larger majority of seventy-seven. By an improvement, however, upon the old fashioned tactics of the quondam leader, the new anti-Maynooth party returned to the charge a second time in the same Committee; and, availing themselves of the technical opportunity afforded by the bringing up of the Report, again moved the omission of the obnoxious item. The supporters of the grant, unprepared for the ruse, were not forthcoming in their usual strength at the division. The majority in its favour, on this occasion, accordingly, was reduced to thirteen; and, as it was pathetically complained by Lord John Chichester, had it not been for an accident to one of the dining-room bells, which (no doubt under some secret Jesuitical influence,) failed to give warning in time of the division, it is not unlikely that the vote might, through this manœuvre, have been altogether lost.

At length the momentous year 1851, arrived. On the 16th of June in that year, a debate, more animated than any previous one, took place on the motion of Mr. Spooner. The general religious excitement of the period of course told upon the Maynooth question. Although the numbers of those who, upon the division, supported the vote, continued very much the same as in previous years, the list of its opponents was more than doubled; and eventually, after a long discussion, the vote was barely saved by a nominal majority of two!

With the memory of the progressive excitement of the time still fresh upon us, it is hardly necessary to say that the next year's vote was fatal to the unlucky grant for repairs. All the explanations and remonstrances attempted by the ministers were disregarded. The vote was summarily rejected. Lord John Russell, in a speech more in harmony with his ancient fame than with the tenor of his immediate antecedents, indignantly exposed the flagrant inconsistency of the proceeding. He showed that as long as the law provided for the maintenance of the institution, it was the duty of parliament to take care that the buildings themselves, as the property of the public, should be protected from decay; and declared, on the part of the government, that as the parliament had refused the ordinary means of securing this object, it would be their duty to devise some other means of preserving the property of the public entrusted to their care. We must add, however, that this pledge has never been fulfilled. The Bursar, in

his written evidence, (Part I. p. 186,) states, that "at present (1853) nobody appears to be legally responsible for keeping the building in a proper state of repair." And he anticipates that the effect of the withdrawal of the annual vote for repairs will be "to bring back the old portion of the buildings to the dilapidated state in which the Board of Public Works found them."

The vote for repairs has never since been proposed. In the Estimates of Lord Derby's government in 1852, (whether the omission was ascribable to them or their predecessors was a matter of much discussion at the time,) it did not appear. Nor, pending the sitting of the Royal Commission appointed in 1853, to inquire into the general question of the endowment, did it seem advisable to Lord Aberdeen's government to bring forward a subordinate matter of detail. Hence, since the vote of 1852, the care of providing for the repairs of the building has been utterly abandoned both by the legislature, and by the executive. It has fallen exclusively upon the Trustees of the College; and as in the administration of the funds arising from the annual grant, their hands are tied up by the specific destination of the several portions of this grant provided in the Act itself, it may easily be imagined how very imperfectly the end must have been attained.

The after history of the antagonism to Maynooth may be briefly told. Stimulated by success in this measure of detail, Mr. Spooner speedily addressed himself to the overthrow of the principle itself. Two different lines of attack were selected.

The first was the old expedient of inquiry, proposed, however, in the most offensive form.

Mr. Gladstone's bill for the removal of certain charges from the Consolidated Fund to the Annual Estimates, suggested the second. Relying, as well on the temper of the House of Commons as on the pressure of bigotry without, that if the main endowment were once made dependent on an annual vote, it would share the fate of the petty item of "Repairs," Mr. Spooner proposed, as an amendment, that the Maynooth Endowment should be added to the list of Charges to be transferred from the Consolidated Fund to the Estimates; and so active was the rally of his supporters, and so formidable their organization, that it was only after a declaration on the part of ministers, that, if the amendment regarding Maynooth were

carried, the whole Bill should be abandoned, that they succeeded in defeating his proposition, and even then only by a very inconsiderable majority.

Meanwhile, however, the motion for inquiry had been proceeding. Thrown back in the House of Commons by successive adjournments, to the close of a crowded and protracted session, it was conceded in the following year by the voluntary act of the government, although in a form different from that which had been sought, and which alone was desired by the fanatical party with which the proposal had originated. Instead of a Parliamentary Committee, a Royal Commission was appointed, to "inquire into the management and government of the college of Maynooth, the discipline and course of studies pursued therein, and the effects produced by the increased grants conferred by parliament in 1845."

It cannot be doubted that the selection of this form of enquiry in preference to that moved for by Mr. Spooner, was prompted by a friendly consideration, as well for the feelings of the Catholic community, as for the successful attainment of the true object to which alone such enquiry, on the part of the legislature, could legitimately be directed. It is plain that, for these purposes, an orderly and well-considered investigation, deliberately conducted by a Royal Commission, could not fail to prove infinitely more effective than the erratic and irrelevant interrogatories of a partisan committee. It is plain, too, that the real object of the advocates of the latter was, not to ascertain the facts connected specially with Maynooth College, but rather to afford an opportunity for a legalized onslaught upon the common doctrines and the universal system of the Catholic religion; and it is equally evident that the only result of such a proceeding must be not the discovery of truth, but the imbittering of prejudice; not the satisfactory settlement of the disputed points of the enquiry, but the raising of an infinity of extraneous but intensely irritating issues, involving not merely the withdrawal of the endowment of Maynooth, but the re-enactment of the Penal Code—not the repeal of the Act of 1845, but the reversal of the Act of 1829.

We freely admit, therefore, the friendly disposition towards Catholics with which the government of Lord Aberdeen, in acceding to the demand for enquiry, placed that duty in the hands of a Royal Commission rather than

of a Parliamentary Committee. And, indeed, this very circumstance only places in a stronger light for Catholics the petty evidences of their social inferiority in the eye of the legislature with which the history of this Commission abounds. We shall enumerate a few of these in passing;—not that we consider them of much importance in themselves, especially when compared with the (unhappily too abundant) grievances under which we labour; but in order to show the seeming incapacity to judge Catholics by the same rule with their fellow subjects, even in the most ordinary affairs of life, which pervades every department of the legislation, as well as of the administration of our rulers.

It is hardly necessary to observe that the Maynooth Commission followed immediately upon the similar Royal Commissions of Inquiry into the state of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, issued in 1850, and of the University of Dublin in 1851. It may be worth while, therefore, to compare its constitution and proceedings with those of each and all of the three University Commissions. The comparison, of course, is not in all things completely fair; but it will sufficiently illustrate the unequal treatment of which we complain, and of the injustice of which, from long habit, even our warmest friends hardly seem to feel conscious.

The Oxford Commissioners were selected with the most respectful consideration for the wishes and interests of the University authorities. The list, before it was finally resolved on, *was submitted for approval to the Board of Heads of Houses.** They were seven in number, every one of whom was directly connected with the University. Only one of the entire number, Mr. Dampier, was a layman. The remaining six included a bishop, a dean, the Master of Pembroke College, the Head-Master of Westminster, the Savilian Professor of Geometry, and a member of Queen's College. It was not alone that they were all churchmen; not alone that, deeply as the interests of Dissenters were involved in the enquiry, not a single member of the dissenting body was admitted; not alone that, although the large proportion of the colleges, and the bulk of the endowments are of Catholic origin, granted

* Report, p. 2.

for Catholic purposes, and held by tenure of Catholic observances, no one ever dreamed of placing a Catholic upon the list. It was still further secured that the Commission should be composed *exclusively of Oxford men*. No member even of Cambridge University appears, still less of the Irish or Scottish universities, or of the more modern English educational establishments, or of those of continental countries. All was Oxford, from the first to the last, from the chairman to the secretary. It was a purely Protestant and exclusively Oxford Commission.

So also the Cambridge Commissioners were all Protestants and Cambridge men. The list comprises three clergymen, (the majority,) viz., the Bishop of Chester, the Dean of Ely, and Rev. Adam Sedgwick, the Woodwardian Professor of Geology; the other members were the Attorney General and Sir John Herschel, both graduates of the University.

The Dublin University Commission in like manner was exclusively Protestant. It comprised two bishops of the Established Church of Ireland, the Professor of Law in the University, the Lord Chancellor for Ireland, Lord Rosse, and Mr. Cooper of Markree,—all members of the University. The Secretary of the Commission was the ex-professor of political economy, a Protestant of course.

Let us now see what was the case in the Maynooth Commission.

Maynooth College is not only exclusively designed for Catholics, but exclusively for Catholic ecclesiastics. Now it is well known that the education of Catholic ecclesiastics, both professional and general, is, and must always be, conducted on principles peculiarly adapted to the peculiar state of life which they are destined to embrace. The very duties and obligations which they undertake evidently imply the fitness, and indeed the necessity, of such peculiar training. The philosophical mind of Edmund Burke could understand that “the priest’s duty of confession alone is sufficient to set in the strongest light the necessity of his having an appropriate mode of education;”^{*} nor is it possible, we will not say merely for a Protestant, but even for a Catholic layman to enter fully into the complete requirements, or indeed the elementary principles, of Catholic clerical

* Correspondence vol. i. p. 540.

education. It was naturally to be expected, therefore, that in the composition of the Maynooth Commission this important consideration would not be overlooked. It was fair to expect that, whereas in all the other Commissions the clerical element had been so fully, (and in the case of Oxford, so preponderantly,) represented, some such provision at least should be made for the effectiveness of the Maynooth Inquiry. Yet, will it be believed, that whereas Oxford and Cambridge had each one bishop, the Dublin University two, besides a large admixture of inferior clerical dignitaries, among their Commissioners, yet in the Maynooth enquiry, where, above all others, it was especially demanded by the nature of the case, not a single Catholic bishop or priest was even thought of for the purpose?

Again, in all the other Royal Commissions, the governing and teaching body of the University was, as was perfectly natural and proper, fairly represented, and in that of Oxford especially, represented very largely and liberally. The Secretaries too, in all three, were chosen upon the same principle. In the Maynooth Commission, on the contrary, no one either actually a member of the college, whether as Commissioner or Secretary, appears in any capacity, or educated within its walls.

In all the other Commissions, although two of the Universities do not exclude Catholics, the Commissioners are exclusively Protestant. In the Maynooth Commission, not only were Protestants admitted, but they actually formed the majority; the Chairman was a Protestant; two others of the Commissioners were Protestants—one of them the vicar-general of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and a distinguished writer in the papal aggression controversy; a Protestant secretary was appointed in the first instance; nor was it until after a vigorous remonstrance that the half measure of appointing a Catholic as joint-secretary was acceded to.

It may be said that these appointments, however we may technically object to them, contained a perfectly satisfactory guarantee for the security of Catholic interests. But even if it were so, what a contrast, we repeat, as regards the representation of the ecclesiastical element, does the Commission for Maynooth (though it alone is an exclusively ecclesiastical institution) present to the bishops, deans, heads of houses, and reverend professors,

who figure in all the other Commissions ! Not one Catholic bishop, not a dean, not a dignitary, not a professor, not an ecclesiastic of any kind, appears upon the list ! Of the five Maynooth Commissioners, two were Catholic laymen ; most exemplary and zealous Catholic gentlemen, no doubt, but from the very nature of the case, as laymen, entirely inadequate representatives, with all their zeal and devotedness, of the interests of an ecclesiastical institution. How many points must arise in the course of such an enquiry, for the full consideration, or even the appreciation, of which no one not intimately conversant with the routine of ecclesiastical discipline could possibly be prepared ! Now for this full provision, many persons will say excessive provision, was made in the constitution of all the other Commissions. The Catholic institution alone is thought unworthy of the consideration.

The same marked and galling distinction in the manner of dealing with Catholics and that adopted towards Protestants is preserved through the entire proceedings of the Commissions.

In all three University Commissions the enquiry was conducted exclusively by *written interrogatories*, addressed to the witnesses and left to be answered by them at their own leisure and discretion. In the Maynooth Inquiry, besides the written interrogatories, a lengthened and searching *oral examination* was resorted to. Every one recollects the insulting insinuations, and the open charges of dishonest tampering with the short-hand writer's notes, which Mr. Spooner and his bigot followers founded upon the fact that the Commissioners permitted to the Maynooth witnesses the privilege (which is always conceded) of revising and correcting the notes of their evidence before it was finally printed. But no one ever thought of complaining that by the very nature of the course adopted in reference to every one of the Protestant institutions, the fullest and most unrestricted license of "cooking evidence," of withholding it, and of modifying it in every conceivable way, was afforded to each and every witness who was invited to afford information !

In the University Commissions, again, the witnesses were invited to give information, but no steps were taken to enforce compliance. At Oxford especially the Commissioners' invitation was treated with the utmost disregard. The majority of the colleges declined to return

any answers to the interrogatories, or to afford any assistance or information to the Commissioners.* The correspondence of the Commissioners with these recusant bodies, indeed, is highly amusing. Some,—(as Dr. Plumptre of University College, Dr. Harrington of Brasenose, the venerable Dr. Routh of Magdalen,)—explicitly declare that they do not hold themselves “at liberty to publish information respecting their corporate revenues or internal affairs.” Others, as Dr. Reade of Magdalen College, simply decline, without alleging any reason, “to give the information requested, or to supply the Commissioners with a copy of the statutes.” Others again, as Dr. Wilson of Trinity College, Dr. Symonds, Warden of Wadham, Mr. Richards of Exeter, and several others, barely acknowledge the receipt of the Commissioners’ requisition. Others again, as Dr. Bliss, of St. Mary’s Hall, with provoking courtesy, add, to the acknowledgment of receipt an expression of thanks for the attention. Some, making a distinction between their corporate and their individual capacities, decline to afford information in the former, but tender it unreservedly in the latter. Others, as Dr. Wynter of John’s College, with a still more equivocal distinction, freely communicate with the Commissioners as to the *literary concerns* of the colleges, but refuse to do so as to their *revenues*. And thus, on various grounds, or on no grounds at all, the great majority, both of Halls and Colleges, refused in any way to afford information or assistance to the Commission. The Commissioners “regret for the sake of the University itself, that a different course was not pursued ;”† but they took no steps to enforce its being done.

Such was the manner of proceeding at Oxford. In the Maynooth Commission no such indulgence appears. The Secretary of the Board of Trustees, the President, vice-President, Deans and Professors, as well as a large number of students, were interrogated orally by the Commissioners;—the students being even subjected to an *examination for the purpose of testing their literary proficiency!*

* Report p. 1.

† Report p. 2.

We are far from desiring to press the contrast in this particular to undue lengths; and we fully recognize the distinction between an establishment founded and endowed almost exclusively by Parliament, and an institution which is almost entirely the growth of private munificence, and which possesses rights and privileges guaranteed by charter and confirmed by the use of ages. But, in considering this claim of exemption from the jurisdiction of the Royal Commission, it is impossible not to be struck by the strange inconsistency of the grounds on which it was maintained and allowed, with the very first principles of the present condition of almost every college which forms part of the University. The tenure upon which the majority of these corporations hold the rich possessions which have come down to them from Catholic times, is the fulfilment of certain duties, and the discharge of certain obligations, purely catholic in their character, and not merely inconsistent with the profession of Protestantism, but actually impossible outside of the Catholic Church. The Fellows of William of Wykeham's foundation, New College, are bound by statute (to the observance of which they were required to swear,) to *hear mass daily*, and to *say five Our Fathers*, and *fifty Hail Marys*. University College holds its lands on the condition of the *perpetual celebration of masses for the soul of William of Durham*; Adam de Brom's bequest to St. Mary's College requires that four chaplains shall be maintained to celebrate service in the church every day for ever. The thirteen chaplains of Queen's College are required to say *masses for the souls of Edward III. and Philippa*; and there are a number of other very curious observances directed by the articles of the foundation, not one of which is any longer maintained or thought of. The Fellows of Lincoln College (which strangely enough was the college of John Wesley,) are bound by oath "never to *favour any heresies or errors*, and especially that pestiferous sect (the Lollards) *which attacks the sacraments*, estates, and possessions of the Church."* The statutes containing these and many similar ordinances, and the oath by which the members pledge themselves to their observance, still, for the most part remained unrepealed; although, as the commissioners

* Report p. 212.

remark, "that these statutes are observed, or that they *can be* observed, no one would seriously contend." Sir William Hamilton instances it as a curious illustration of the Protestant doctrine of mental reservation, even upon oath, that the Fellows and other officials of these colleges continued, year after year, to swear to the observance of statutes which were clearly incompatible with Protestantism, and to the fulfilment of duties for which their very position incapacitated them. Now, when we find the members of these very colleges the foremost in resisting the authority of the Royal Commission, on the ground that they are bound by collegiate statutes to withhold all "information concerning their corporate revenues and internal affairs," a question irresistibly obtrudes itself;—by what authority have they been released from the observance of the statutes which have just been enumerated? Is it not by that very authority of the crown and of the legislature which they now find it convenient to resist? Is it not by that authority, which, in overthrowing the Catholic Church and establishing Protestantism in its stead, rendered the observance of the Catholic statutes illegal and impossible? "It is almost needless to observe," says the Report,* "that, since the Reformation, the *Legislature has prohibited* what was perhaps not the chief object of the founders, but what was one of great importance in their eyes. Masses and prayers for the dead have not been said in the colleges since the days of Queen Elizabeth. The processions and the frequent ceremonies have passed away. The services of the Church of England have, *in obedience to the law*, been substituted everywhere for those of the Roman Catholic Church." Now, if the authority of the crown can be recognized in the one case, and recognized in so sacred a manner as to be made the ground of release from a duty solemnly undertaken upon oath, surely it is an unworthy evasion to represent that authority as incapable of releasing from the same statutes, so as to warrant their being made public for the information of the legislature! The crown, forsooth, can permit the Fellows to violate a solemn compact, but it has no power to permit them to publish its violation! The crown, for example, can dispense University College in the solemn obligation of *saying masses*

* Report p. 144.

for the soul of its founder, William of Durham ; in virtue of the fulfilment of which obligation the collegiate property is still enjoyed ; but the crown has no power to permit University College to disclose the amount of the property which it holds in virtue of this violated compact ! In the case of lands which Bishop Flemming and Bishop Rotheram bequeathed to Lincoln College, on condition that its members should swear never to favour or further the “ pestiferous sect which attacks the Sacraments of the Church,” it is competent to the Crown to legalize their tenure *by men who openly profess that very heresy* ; but the crown cannot give authority to a Commissioner to put a single interrogatory as to these facts or any other connected with the doctrine or discipline of the College ! These are nice distinctions which we should be very sorry to think we were expected to understand. And we cannot help adding, that the laxity of principle in the interpretation of oaths, which the practice of these colleges implies, fully equals the most exaggerated license with regard to mental reservation, which has ever been ascribed to Caramuel or Escobar ; with this additional aggravation, that the very oaths in question formally exclude by an express clause any “ Declarations, expositions, or glosses, anywhere repugnant to the ordinances or statutes ” understood “ according to the literal and grammatical sense and meaning of the same.”

We have dwelt upon this part of the contrast, however, not with the idea of complaining that the Oxford Commission did not take measures to compel obedience to its authority, but simply in order that those antagonists of Maynooth who clamour for further enquiry, may see what has already been done in one case, and what has not been done in the other. The most uncompromising of these can hardly venture, in the face of such a contrast, to deny that, on the part of the Maynooth Commission, the fault, if any, as to the extent of the enquiry, certainly does not lie on the side of deficiency.

But there is another point of disparity between the proceedings of the University Commissioners and those of the Maynooth, which illustrates the social and religious inferiority of Catholics, too forcibly and too painfully to be passed over in silence.

We have already seen that the evidence upon the state of the Universities was sought exclusively among Protestants, and, indeed, almost entirely among the members of the Universities themselves. Now, whatever we may feel in our hearts, we are not going to utter a word of complaint that not a single member of the creed of Walter de Merton, or William of Durham, or Adam de Brom, or Henry Chichele, was invited to offer evidence on the present state or the original destination of the institutions which England owes to the munificence of these and such other admirable men of the old Catholic times. We have no notion of complaining that not one of the many eminent members of the Universities who, during the last fifteen years, have resigned their academical preferments and left the communion of the Church of England, is to be found among the witnesses to the state of education, of morality, of religious doctrine, or of religious discipline in any of these institutions. Above all, were we to make it a grievance, as Catholics and as British subjects, that no communication was had with the authorities of the Catholic Church, as to the evidence of this class which they might deem it useful to offer;—that no application was addressed to Cardinal Wiseman, to the Catholic Primate of Ireland, to the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, or to the Superior of the *Collegio dei Convertiti* at Rome, for the purpose of ascertaining from them the names of such “gentlemen, formerly educated at Oxford, at Cambridge, or in Trinity College, Dublin, as they might suggest for examination;” what would not be the virtuous indignation of every loyal gentleman of England at this intolerable audacity!

Now, what was, we do not say suggested, but actually done, in the case of Maynooth?

“As we were aware (say the Commissioners in their Report) that certain specific charges had been from time to time made against the teaching in Maynooth, which charges it was alleged could be substantiated by persons, who, having been educated in that Institution, had afterwards become Protestants, we caused our Secretaries to communicate with the Rev. Thomas Scott, secretary to a Society called “The Priests’ Protection Society;” and also with the Rev. Edward F. Wolesley, secretary to a Society called “The Friends of Conscience Society,” for the purpose of ascertaining from them the names of such gentlemen, formerly educated at Maynooth, as they might suggest for examination.”—*Report*, p. 22.

The Commissioners accordingly were furnished with the names of ten apostate Irish priests, whom they directed their secretaries to summon before the Commission !

Few of our readers can fail to be aware that the Societies thus formally invited to offer evidence on the subject of Maynooth, are avowedly founded for the purpose of receiving, protecting, and subsidizing the outcasts or deserters from the Catholic religion who may choose to range themselves under the standard of Protestantism !

We do not stop to enquire into the character or antecedents of the individuals whose names were supplied for examination. The selection itself is sufficient for our purpose as illustrating the contrast which we have all along been enforcing.

Now we are not to be understood as censuring the conduct of the Commissioners in this particular. On the contrary, none should rejoice more than Catholics themselves at the opportunity of a vindication so honourable as the very testimony of these adversaries contains. We believe further that the Commissionerse xercised a wise discretion in the course which they pursued. It is clear that, as a means of silencing the clamour for inquiry, and of putting to shame the prejudices on which it was founded, such a step was absolutely indispensable ; considering the spirit of the anti-Maynooth party in England, and the spirit in which, not alone the question of Maynooth, but every other subject connected with the Catholic religion, is approached by that party. What we do complain of is this very spirit—this very tone and temper of the Protestant mind towards Catholics and their religion ;—the spirit which deals one measure to Catholics and another to their enemies—which treats one religion with favour and with trust, and the other with hostility, suspicion, and contumely—which looks upon the members of one as gentlemen and men of honour, and regards those of the other as unscrupulous, mendacious, fraudulent, and insensible to every principle of truth and sincerity, where their own interests and those of the Church are concerned. We complain that all this is quietly assumed as a matter of course. We complain, above all, that this is the normal position of Catholicism in England and in Ireland, pursuing us into every phase of our life, poisoning our participation in every one of the common institutions of the country, and marking us with

the brand of moral inferiority in every one of the common relations of citizenship, religious, social and political.

And this brings us to a very important subject connected with the Maynooth Inquiry, on which we shall find it necessary to dwell at some length. The course adopted by the Commissioners in taking the evidence of avowed apostates from the Catholic religion, as to the state of the College of Maynooth, cannot but be felt to give to the Inquiry, however it may seem to have been limited by the Commissioners themselves, a directly theological and doctrinal character. The evidence itself, although clearly without any such intention on the part of the Commissioners, assumed a strong doctrinal complexion. The step, too, was, at all events, a yielding to the clamour of that party whose opposition to Maynooth rests on grounds purely doctrinal; for we cannot too frequently repeat, that the opposition of this party is not to the college, as such, but to the whole Catholic system represented therein, and that this characteristic of the opposition is directly brought into play by the relation which, as apostate members, their chosen witnesses bear to the Catholic Church.

Now we protest, once for all, against the assumption upon which all this is founded, and on which not only the public, but the Parliament itself, appears to proceed in all the discussions concerning Maynooth, as inconsistent not only with the religious liberty and equality to which Catholics, as subjects of the realm, are entitled, but also as directly at variance with the securities guaranteed by parliament at the first endowment of Maynooth, and renewed in every subsequent enactment connected with that endowment. We repudiate, as inconsistent with our clearest legal and constitutional rights, all pretension on the part of the state to institute a direct enquiry of a doctrinal nature. If the state could ever claim such a right, it formally renounced that claim by what we ought to regard as the charter of Catholic Ecclesiastical Education in Ireland. The College of Maynooth was expressly endowed "for the education exclusively of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion." The original constitution of the endowment shuts out all possible right of enquiry as to what may be the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion. The sole question as to the doctrine of Maynooth which can be mooted consistently with its original destination, is; whether it really teaches the doctrines of the Roman

Catholic religion ;—whether its teaching is satisfactory to the ecclesiastical authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. It is needless, therefore, to say, that a large proportion of the eloquence expended by the antagonists of Maynooth in denouncing its damnable and idolatrous doctrines, is utterly irrelevant to the real question ; or rather, perhaps, if it have any relevancy at all, is so far an argument in favour of the maintenance of the endowment. The only point which can enter into consideration as between the parties to the original agreement, the State on one hand, and the Catholic Church in Ireland on the other, being, whether the doctrines of the Catholic Church are duly taught therein. The more satisfactorily the declaimers against Popery demonstrate the rank Popery of the Maynooth teaching, the more stringently do they establish its claim to a dotation which was conceded for that express purpose, and with that explicit understanding.

Nothing can be more plain than that the original founders of Maynooth College renounced, by express compact, any such right of enquiry into the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic religion. The Act of 1795, (section 4,) while it requires for the validity of all “bye-laws, rules, regulations, and statutes, for the government of the said academy,” that they shall be laid before the Lord Lieutenant, and shall only be held binding in case at the expiration of a month from their being laid before him he shall not have signified his disapproval, expressly exempts from the necessity of this observance, “bye-laws, rules, regulations, and statutes, affecting the exercise of the Popish or Roman Catholic religion and the religious discipline thereof.”

The amended Act of 1800, in appointing a mixed board of visitors, partly Protestant and partly Catholic, continues to carry out the same provision. The third section withdraws from the common jurisdiction of the visitorial body all matters which affect the “exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, or the religious doctrine or discipline thereof within the said college or seminary ;” and the ninth section reserves to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic visitors all questions or disputes connected with Catholic doctrine or discipline.

“And be it enacted, That nothing herein contained shall extend, or be construed to extend, to any bye-laws, rules, and regulations

affecting *the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, or the doctrine or discipline or worship thereof, within the said College or Seminary.*

“And be it further enacted, That in all matters which relate to the *exercise, doctrine, and discipline of the Roman Catholic religion*, the visitorial power over the said College shall be exercised *exclusively by such of the said Visitors as are, or shall be, of the Roman Catholic religion*, in the presence of the Lord Chancellor, or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, and of the three Chief Judges, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if they, or any of them, shall think proper to attend.”—Appendix, p. 2.

If any doubt should be raised as to the construction which we have put upon these clauses, we need only refer to the correspondence of Edmund Burke on the subject of the foundation and endowment of a college for the education of the Catholic clergy. Burke's correspondence with the Rev. Dr. Hussey, the first president of the college, and the chief actor in the negotiations which led to its establishment, shows that he had well and carefully considered this very subject; and he urges with his characteristic earnestness, and with that strong good sense which all his letters, even more than his more elaborate works, display, the necessity of providing ample securities against the possibility of state intermeddling in the doctrine or discipline of the College. There is one passage from a letter addressed to Dr. Hussey, on St. Patrick's Day, 1795, which is so much to the point, and so conclusive as to the view which we have taken, that we must find room for it here.

“It is my poor opinion, that if the necessary money is given to your own free disposal (that is, to the disposal of the Catholic prelates), that it ought to be readily and thankfully accepted, from whatever hand it comes. It is my equally clear opinion, that they ought not only to consent, but to desire, that an account of the expenditure with proper vouchers, should be annually or biennially, according to convenience, laid before a committee of the House of Commons, to prevent the very suspicion of jobbing, to which all public institutions in Ireland are liable. All other interference whatever, if I were in the place of these reverend persons, I would resist; and would much rather trust to God's good providence, and the contributions of your own people, for the education of your clergy, than to put it into the hands of your known, avowed, and implacable enemies—into the hands of those who make it their merit and their boast that they are your enemies—the very fountains of your morals and your religion. I have considered this matter at large, and at various times, and I have considered it in

relation to the designs of your enemies. The scheme of these colleges, as you well know, did not originate from them ; but they will endeavour to pervert the benevolence and liberality of others into an instrument of their own evil purposes. Be well assured that they never did, and that they never will consent, to give one shilling of money for any other purpose than to do you mischief; if you consent to put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end, not only of the Catholic religion, but of all religion, all morality, all law, and all order, in that unhappy kingdom.”—Correspondence of the Right Honourable Edmund Burke, vol. iii. p. 298-9.

In another letter he urges the necessity of this same precaution by the example of the charter-schools ; and indeed the same principle runs through the entire correspondence with Dr. Hussey.

Now it is impossible to doubt that the clauses in the acts of 1795 and of 1800, were but *the embodiment of the precaution which Burke suggested* ; and that it was the wish of the Catholic bishops to stipulate for, and of the parliament of the time to concede, the desired immunity from doctrinal supervision on the part of the legislature.

The Act of 1845 is equally explicit. By that Act the visitorial body was again reconstructed ; but, as the right of appointing five visitors, in addition to those elected by the trustees, was vested in the crown, the tribunal practically remained as before, a mixed one ; and at the first nomination three out of the five royal visitors were Protestants. Nevertheless, their power also is similarly restricted. The 17th and 18th Sections are as follows :—

“ Provided always, and be it enacted, That the Authority of the said Visitors shall not extend to, or in any manner affect, the *Exercises of the Roman Catholic Religion, or the religious Doctrine or Discipline thereof* within the said College or Seminary, otherwise than as herein-after is provided ; and that in visiting the said College or Seminary the said Visitors shall judge and determine according to such Bye-Laws, Rules, and Regulations as have been or shall be made for the Government and Discipline thereof, pursuant to the Provisions of the said recited Acts or of this Act respectively.

“ And whereas by the said Act herein-before secondly recited it is amongst other things enacted, that in all matters which relate to the Exercise, Doctrine and Discipline of the Roman Catholic Religion, the visitorial power over the said College shall be exercised exclusively by such of the said Visitors as are, or shall be, of

the Roman Catholic Religion, in presence of the Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, and of the Three Chief Judges, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if they or any of them shall think proper to attend ; be it therefore enacted, That in all matters which relate to the *Exercise, Doctrine and Discipline of the Roman Catholic Religion*, the visitorial power over the said College shall be exercised by such of *the said Visitors of the Roman Catholic Religion* as have been or shall be elected under the Provisions of the said Act secondly above recited, in the presence of the said Persons whom Her Majesty shall, by Warrant under the Sign Manual, from time to time nominate and appoint as aforesaid to be Visitors of the said College, if they or any of them shall think proper to attend.”—*Report App.*, p. 8.

It is clear, therefore, that, as a mere matter of contract, the assumption on which the demand for enquiry into the theological teaching of Maynooth rests is utterly untenable. Immunity from doctrinal control was stipulated by the bishops. The right of doctrinal supervision on the part of the legislature was solemnly and repeatedly renounced or disclaimed. Both parties wisely shrank from an arrangement which, in the earnest phrase of Burke, would have been, on the one side, “to have sold the Catholic religion for money,” and on the other, or rather on both, “to have made an end not only of the Catholic religion, but of all religion, all morality, all law, and all order in our unhappy kingdom.”

These observations, however, apply chiefly to the popular notions which prevail among the antagonists of Maynooth, as to the rights of parliament in regard to the education there imparted, and not to the actual proceeding of the Commission, of which we must not be understood as complaining. On the contrary, in a frank and liberal spirit, which we gladly acknowledge, the Commissioners, in their Report, fully recognize the immunity which we have been claiming. If “in investigating the course of studies pursued at Maynooth, they have enquired into the doctrines and principles of the Roman Catholic Church inculcated there,” it has only been, they state, “in so far as regarded principles in which they conceived that the State was directly interested, or upon which the teaching of Maynooth had been impugned as immoral.”*

And in closing the section of their Report which regards the discipline of the college, they declare that “upon all these questions of discipline and religious training, although the state has a deep interest, yet *as it cannot directly interfere*, they have contented themselves with providing the best materials within their reach, upon which the trustees, with whom the powers and the responsibility rest, may come to a practical conclusion.”* But although these are the views upon which the present Report has been framed, it is plain that the popular clamour for enquiry has a far wider range. The spirit in which the anti-Maynooth pledges have been exacted by numberless constituencies in England—the avowed plans of the various associations organized with the express object of procuring the suppression of the college—the pathetic lamentations of their great parliamentary organ, Mr. Spooner, over the “National Sin” which its very existence involves—Mr. Newdegate’s denunciation of its endowment as a subsidizing of idolatry—and Mr. White-side’s harsh and illtempered revival of the old bugbear of Jesuitism;—all are an earnest of the course which the Inquiry might have been expected to take in the hands of a parliamentary committee, and of the wise discretion which was used by the government in intrusting it, by preference, to a Royal Commission. The investigation, it is true, frequently diverged into matters which certainly lay beyond the line which the Commissioners had traced out. The enquiry into the nature and extent of the religious training of the students was extremely minute; and one exceedingly important topic to which they professedly addressed themselves—that which regards the theological instruction imparted as a preparation for the confessional—was clearly, and of its own nature, beyond their jurisdiction, as that jurisdiction is defined by the successive acts of parliament detailed above. But we see no reason to complain of the spirit in which it was conducted. No reluctance was exhibited by the witnesses to afford the fullest information on all these topics; the Report of the Commissioners furnishes a complete vindication upon all these grounds; and, as regards the most painful of them all, we are sure that the authorities of the

college, as well as the whole Irish Church, would, of themselves, gladly, not alone submit to enquiry, but even invite it, if they could hope that any explanation upon their part would suffice to disarm the unreasoning bigotry which is the very foundation and life of the hostility with which they are popularly regarded.

Indeed, the best evidence of the baselessness of any such hope, as well as of the spirit in which the enquiry was demanded by this class of the enemies of Maynooth, is supplied by the manner in which it has been received. Scarce had the Report been laid upon the table, when the house was startled by a programme of the awful discoveries of the imaginative member for North Warwickshire, as to the suppression, mutilation, and alteration of the evidence, as to secret concert with Rome in the publication of the evidence and the framing of the Report, and in general as to the dishonest and collusive character of the whole proceeding. The bubble, of course, burst as soon as it reached the open air; but the ready favour with which it was received; the unenquiring facility with which the Journal which claims to be the great organ and guide of English opinion, accepted the charge as to the cooking of evidence and collusion with Rome; and above all, the insulting insinuations in reference to Catholics, and to their general untrustworthiness;—are but too significant a proof of the folly of trusting to a good cause in a contest where long-continued ascendancy has produced habitual contempt on the one side, and has shocked and almost extinguished self-reliance upon the other.

A still further evidence, however, of this spirit will be found in the fact that, whereas the result, on all those points on which the Commissioners felt themselves at liberty to enquire;—whether in reference to the condition of the college; or in reference to the “doctrines and principles there inculcated, in which the state was directly interested;” or to those points “upon which the teaching of Maynooth was impugned as immoral;”—has proved a complete vindication of the institution; nevertheless the presentation of the Report has been met by a renewal of all the old hostilities, and by a return to the ancient tactics for the repeal of the act of 1845, just as though no Inquiry had ever been instituted. The maintenance of Maynooth is still, as before, reprobated as a “national sin.”

There is no possibility, therefore, of shutting our eyes to

the painful deduction, that as far as the vast body of the antagonists of the Maynooth Endowment are concerned, the question is definitively settled ; and settled altogether irrespectively of the present or any future inquiry. It is plain, in one word, that, in their mind, the struggle is not with Maynooth, but with Popery ; and that, in order that any possible Inquiry should have the effect of reconciling them to its toleration, it should be an Inquiry which would demonstrate that the college had ceased to teach Popery in any of its forms, and had, by a common act of its members, shaken off obedience to Rome, and formed an alliance, offensive and defensive, with the Priest's Protection Society !

This is not the place to discuss formally the justice or the policy of the Maynooth Endowment. While the church of less than one-sixth of the people of Ireland revels in all the luxury of a state provision ; while its whole yearly income—(in Tithe Rent charge £650,000, in Income of Ecclesiastical Commission £80,000, in Episcopal Revenue £130,000.)—exceeds £850,000 ; is there any one who could venture to say that if the Catholic religion is tolerated at all, its members, who form at least five-sixths of the people, may not justly claim the only dotation which they choose to accept, amounting to less than one-thirteenth of that enjoyed by the favoured minority ? While the annual income derived from parishes in Ireland, none of which contain more than fifty Protestants, (whereas there are nearly two hundred which contain less than twenty, two hundred more, which have less than ten, and one hundred and fifty, which are literally without a single Protestant inhabitant,)—while the income of parishes of this class in Ireland amounts to £58,000 a-year, would it not be monstrous to offer a word of objection to one single dotation for the ecclesiastical purposes of the whole Catholic body, less than one half the amount annually applied to Protestant purposes in so scandalous a disproportion ?*

We fancy, indeed, that there is no one, even among the ranks of Mr. Spooner's supporters, who will be bold enough to question these conclusions in the abstract. In truth,

* For details see the speech of Mr. Ward, April 23, 1845, *Hansard*, vol. cxlv. pp. 1147-50.

the only consistent enemy of Maynooth, upon religious grounds, is the man who objects to everything Popish, and would refuse not merely to endow, but even to tolerate, the Catholic religion altogether.

But while it would be a work of supererogation to argue with adversaries of this class, it may be well that Catholics themselves should clearly understand their position in relation to this endowment.

Disgusted by the unceasing attacks upon their religion, of which the unhappy discussions regarding it have been made, and continue to be made, the vehicle, a disposition has grown in a section of the Catholic body to look with indifference, and even with disfavour, on a dotation which is enjoyed (if, indeed, it can be called enjoyment) on so painful and precarious a footing. There have not been wanting counsellors to suggest that it is too dearly purchased at the price of so much bitterness and humiliation ; that whatever may be its worth in money, its value as an instrument of Catholic progress is extremely questionable ; and above all, that, in the great and vital struggle upon which all our real interests turn, the contest with the Irish Church Establishment, it is a grievous let and hindrance, drowning our cry in remonstrance and closing our mouths in argument. Nay, upon principles such as these, the Catholic party has been not merely summoned to remain passive in the contest about Maynooth, but even invited to join cordially, though indignantly, in the call for its suppression.

Now there are two classes among the adversaries of the endowment. With which of these are we to unite ?

The first is represented by the honourable member for North Warwickshire ; and, unhappily, from the active and efficient organization of its leaders, and especially from the steady watch which they have kept upon the elections, and the pressure which they have been able to exercise through the constituencies, (even where they formed but a small numerical section), the number has, since 1850, become sufficiently formidable.

Against alliance with this section of the anti-Maynooth party, it is not necessary to offer any expostulation. Unless we have a taste for the Thumbscrew or the Scavenger's Daughter, we shall be careful to eschew such perilous companionship.

The second class purposes to seek the withdrawal of the

Maynooth Endowment on the abstract ground of the inexpediency of all religious state-endowment.

Now it is not denied, that a large proportion of those who oppose the endowment of Maynooth upon this ground, are also opposed to it upon purely religious grounds, and are quite as hostile to all Catholic interests, religious and political, as the most devoted follower of the member for North Warwickshire. But it is contended that many, too, are sincere and honest friends of religious freedom; are fully alive to the unjust anomalies in the status of the Catholic body; and are prepared to join cordially with them in working out the great problem of perfect religious liberty, and to co-operate with them in their struggle for complete and unqualified religious and social equality. And, in general, as regards the whole voluntary party, it is contended that, however different may be our religious views from theirs, our interests in this particular are exactly the same; that our great end is a common one; that the obstacle to its attainment is the same for both—the monster grievance of the establishment; that it is only through their co-operation we can ever prudently hope for success; and that this co-operation is only to be purchased by our proving ourselves sincere in the struggle, and beginning the disendowment in our own persons, by casting back that with which the enemy has sought to bribe us into quiescence:

Such is the substance of the view which has been seriously put forward for the consideration of Catholic politicians. It has some superficial plausibility; but it is full of fallacies from the beginning to the end.

It would be a grievous self-delusion to imagine that our interests in the matter are common with those of the so-called Voluntary or state endowment Party.

Among the most active members of that party there are many who yield to none of the British legislature in their hatred of Popery, and their animosity to its professors. The majority of the Scottish non-intrusionists—the representatives of many Dissenting Communities—and many individual members, whom it would be difficult to classify, must be admitted to belong to this category.

But we do not now speak of these. We contend that, even with those of the Voluntary Party who are most free from the taint of anti-catholic prejudice, our interests in this matter are widely and irreconcilably

apart; and, without entering into the abstract questions of the expediency of dispensing altogether with State Endowment, or of the danger to the independence of religion which it may involve, we do not hesitate to say that the catholic body in these kingdoms would be placed upon most unequal terms with the religious communities to which we now allude, in agreeing, at their instance, to renounce all reliance upon permanent endowments, and consenting to depend exclusively for all its religious necessities on the scanty resources of its own impoverished members.

In the first place, the Dissenting Communities, with few exceptions, are rich, and perfectly well able to provide from their own resources for all their religious requirements. The catholic population is incomparably the poorest and the most destitute of all private means of supplying these wants.

Again, a large proportion of those who form the Voluntary Party are mere indifferentists in religion—attached to no particular form of worship, and burdened by no special obligation for maintaining the externals of a religious establishment. Even those among them who can be called formalists in religion at all, do not require for the ministrations of their worship, or for the spiritual care of their congregation, the same variety or extent of ministerial services which are indispensable in the catholic system. In many of them the ministerial office is confined to the Sunday's services, to the supervision of schools, or at best to a very limited circle of pastoral offices. How different from our severely ritual religion, our stately ceremonial, our minute sacramental system, our visitations of the sick, our services for the dead, our attendance on the confessional, our spiritual exercises, and our manifold special practices of devotion! How much more extensive, and proportionately how much more difficult of maintenance, the ecclesiastical establishment of such a Church as ours!

And especially in reference to that very want which Maynooth College is destined to supply, how very unequal are the two cases! The professional education of a minister in most of the Dissenting Communities, has but little that is special to itself. A very brief and superficial initiation in theology; a short course of hermeneutics, superadded to the common stock of secular education, may be said to

constitute a complete clerical education according to the standard which they require. With us, on the contrary, the education of an ecclesiastic is the work of years. Where our system can be freely and fully developed, it commences almost with childhood, and is carried on to the full maturity of manly intellect. Not to speak of the preparatory studies previous to entrance, the Maynooth collegiate course spreads over eight years, and may be extended to eleven.—Four of them are given exclusively to theological and scriptural studies; and of this time a large share is absorbed by the study of moral theology alone. Add to this that the candidates for our priesthood in these countries, drawn as they necessarily must be from the average population of the country, and, therefore, in great part, from very humble life, are entirely unable to defray from their own resources, the expense of this protracted academical course; and it will be easily understood that in renouncing our present provision for that purpose, we should be placing ourselves on the very reverse of equal terms with our proposed allies, for whom a far less expensive scholastic apparatus would amply suffice.

But a still more tangible discrepancy between our position and that of the other members of the so-called Voluntary Party, is, that we are actually in possession of the endowment, while they have nothing to renounce. Both, it is true, suffer in common from one common grievance—the unjust and oppressive ascendancy of the Established Church. Both have a common interest in its overthrow. But there is this important material difference. We have now for a period of sixty years been in the possession of what is certainly a small, but, nevertheless in the unhappy and anomalous condition of our population, most necessary, grant, for the education of our clergy. The Voluntaries have no such endowment. On our side, therefore, petty as it is in itself, there is some set off against the enormous wealth of the State Church. On theirs there is none. It may sound very chivalrous on the part of our champions to offer to relinquish the accidental advantage which we have in this enquiry, in order that we may enter into the common contest upon an equal footing with those who invite our alliance. But we submit that such chivalry is the chivalry of fools. *They* have nothing, either present or prospective, to lose by the proposal; *we* should sacrifice a very important present benefit, without advancing one

single step our prospective claim for the abolition of the grievances which we denounce. No man ever seriously thought of considering the Maynooth endowment as an equivalent for the Protestant Church Establishment; or of pausing for an instant, in consideration of that endowment, in the steady and progressive operations by which the public mind is slowly but surely advancing towards its overthrow. No man ever seriously thought that this petty endowment will stand for an instant in the way of that much desired consummation, when the time shall have become ripe for its accomplishment. Towards this consummation, on the contrary, we hold it to be, so far an important advantage. Paltry as it is in comparison with the riches of the establishment, it is in principle a formal recognition of the justice of the Catholic claim. No one ever dreamed of accepting it as other than a small instalment; but an instalment, nevertheless, *which involves the principle of the entire claim, and which is never to be relinquished till the whole claim shall have been actually discharged.* To abandon it as a preliminary to entering upon the great contest with the establishment, for the purpose of placing ourselves upon equal terms with our Voluntary allies, would, on our part, be just as sensible a proceeding as it would have been on the part of the English and French in the present war to have sent back their fleets from Constantinople—to have thrown their Lancaster guns, their minié rifles, their siege trains, and all other modern appliances of scientific warfare, into the Bosphorus, in order that they might thereby engage in the conflict upon a footing of perfect equality with our Turkish ally!

But above all, how completely do the counsellors who are thus gratuitously generous, forget our history; how utterly do they abandon our historical position, by consenting for a moment to think of us in this contest, as upon the same footing with any of the Voluntary communities, or with any modern religious body whatever. Do they forget that, in addition to every claim of present and prospective political equality—in addition to the claim arising from our position as subjects of one realm, and under the rule of what should be equal laws—we have, besides, what *no modern religious body* can challenge, the historical claim of justice, upon our side? The church property was ours; the charitable foundations were ours; the colleges were

ours; the hospitals were ours; all that is best, noblest, and most generous, in their constitution and tenure, was ours! What catholic, oppressed though he may be by present penury, and pining in the struggle to secure for his poor the very elements of the religious learning, for the highest walks of which their forefathers and his provided with such lavish munificence—what catholic can ever forget this? Does not the very contrast of the present make the memory more painful? “When I consider,” said Mr. Macaulay, in his memorable speech on the Maynooth debate, in 1845, “with what magnificence religion and science are endowed in our Universities; when I call to mind their long streets of palaces, their venerable cloisters, their trim gardens, their chapels with organs, altar-pieces, and stained windows; when I remember their schools, libraries, museums, and galleries of art; when I remember, too, all the solid comforts provided in those places both for instructors and pupils, the stately dwellings of the principals, the commodious apartments of the fellows and scholars; when I remember that the very sizers and servitors are lodged far better than you propose to lodge those priests who are to teach the whole people of Ireland; when I think of the halls, the common-rooms, the bowling-greens, even the stabling of Oxford and Cambridge—the display of old plate on the tables, the good cheer of the kitchen, the oceans of excellent ale in the buttery; and when I remember from whom all this splendour and plenty are derived; when I remember the faith of Edward III., and Henry VI., of Margaret of Anjou, and Margaret of Richmond, of William of Wykeham, of Archbishop Chicheley and Cardinal Wolsey; when I remember what we have taken from the Roman Catholic religion—King’s College, New College, my own Trinity College, and Christ’s Church,—and when I look at the miserable Do-the-boys-Hall we have given them in return—I ask myself if we, and if the Protestant religion, are not disgraced by the comparison!”*

We know it will be said, that the very tenure upon our part of any state-endowment, small though it be in comparison with the overgrown wealth of the Establishment, weakens our hands; and that we should enter the

* Hansard, vol. cxlvii. p. 648.

struggle against that monster grievance, with infinitely more power if we came thereto, like the Protestant Dissenters, utterly unendowed.

Perhaps it may possibly be so. There may be some microscopic difference between the injustice done us, supposing us to be entirely without endowment, and the injustice of which, even after the small instalment of restitution contained in the Maynooth Grant, we still complain. But the difference is much the same as that of which Astronomers speak in seeking the parallax of fixed stars. And what we protest against is, not the proposal itself in the abstract, but what it seems to imply, the recognition of any analogy between the claim of the Catholics of Ireland, and that to which any body of the Voluntaries whatsoever can pretend. "I was quite astonished," said Mr. Macaulay, in the same speech from which we have already quoted, "to hear that, if we made this grant, it would be utterly impossible for us to resist the claim of the Wesleyan Methodists and other Dissenters. Are the cases analogous? Is there the slightest resemblance between them? There are 16,000,000 of people in England. Show me that the Wesleyan Methodists number 13,000,000; that there is an Established Church here with 1,500,000 only of persons belonging to it; that the other Dissenters are receiving a *Regium Donum*,—add to this that large endowments bequeathed to John Wesley and his followers, have been taken away by Parliament and given to the Church, and that the Wesleyan Methodists ask for £26,000 a year to educate their clergy. Give me that case, and I will be prepared to take it into consideration. But you will bring me no such case, either from England or the whole world. It is impossible to give it anywhere but Ireland. How could it be? It could not be in England; it could not be in France; nor in Prussia. It could only be in a country in one particular situation; and what I am going to mention is a consideration which reconciles me much to laying on the nation this burden. It could be only in the case of a weak country, connected with a more powerful country which had abused its power, and enabled the minority to triumph over the majority. Never but in Ireland, and under the circumstances I have mentioned, did such a case exist."*

* Hansard vol. 147, p. 654.

These, we repeat again and again, are the real grounds upon which we claim to hold the Maynooth Endowment;—not as an equivalent for what we have lost by spoliation—not as the price of our relinquishing one jot of the right to which, on all these grounds, we are entitled, not alone in common with all our fellow-subjects, but on special foundations peculiar to ourselves; but simply as a first and inconsiderable instalment of that right, and as a first and distant approach to that perfect equality for which we are struggling!

When that equality shall have been attained; when the rights of Catholics—whether according to their numerical proportions, or according to the religious necessities of their body, or according to the educational wants of their social position—shall have been fully secured; then, and not till then, may we abandon the first ground on which we have established ourselves—a ground which, while it affords a valuable resource in providing for one of the most sensible of our domestic wants, we may also use with the best effect as an advanced position in that great struggle against the existing ascendancy, in which, in common with all lovers of religious equality, we are engaged. But, until all this shall have been secured, we should be acting the part of fools, if we consented to abandon one single advantage which we already possess, in order to give greater effect to the wishes of allies, whose dispositions, as a body, towards ourselves, (however cordial their hostility to the common enemy,) are at the least questionable; and many of whom, (as the Scottish non-intrusionists, and numbers of the English Dissenters,) make no secret of their cordial abhorrence of Popery, even in the very act by which they claim that equality, for the attainment of which they would use us as coadjutors or as instruments.

The Report of the Maynooth Commission, of course, does not deal with the direct question as to the justice or expediency of the Endowment. But one of the chief points to which the Commissioners felt called on to address their enquiry, was, whether any foundation existed for the specific allegations by which the ultra-Protestant party seek to sustain their demand for its withdrawal, viz., that the teaching at Maynooth is inconsistent with the interests of the state; that it is at variance with the principles of

loyalty and good citizenship ; and especially, that, in some particulars, it is grossly and scandalously immoral.

Now, upon all these questions, painful and exciting as they are, the Report is drawn up with great good temper and moderation, but it is perfectly decisive and satisfactory. As regards the two first branches of the allegation, we do not think it necessary to do more than cite the judgment of the commissioners. Whatever may be said in speeches from the hustings, or on the platforms of popular Protestant assemblies, no thinking Protestant really credited the popular declamation, as to the disloyalty of the theological teaching of Maynooth, or its inconsistency with the duties of good citizens and good members of society. That many of the priesthood of Ireland share in the political discontent which pervades the entire popular party in that kingdom ;—that many of the students of Maynooth, who are for the most part taken from the very classes in which such discontent chiefly prevails, are also, almost by the very necessities of birth and early association, partakers of the same feeling ; all this may be freely admitted. But, that these priests and students not only are not such in virtue of the teaching of Maynooth, but even that, when they fall into the extremes into which they are sometimes betrayed, they do so rather in direct contravention of such teaching ;—no one who takes the trouble to examine either the Commissioners' Report or the evidence of the professors and superiors of the college, can entertain a moment's doubt. We content ourselves with a short extract from the Report upon this portion of the investigation.

“ We stated in the outset of our Report that we had thought it our duty to make enquiry into the teaching of Maynooth as to certain points in which the interests of the state and of general morality seem to be more directly concerned ; and upon some of which the spiritual and temporal authority have been, or might be, in conflict ; such as the duty of allegiance, and the obligation of oaths generally under various circumstances, and other questions of a like nature, and the preparation of the students with a view to the functions of the confessional.

“ On these points we can do little more than place the evidence generally before your Majesty, and leave it to produce its own impression. The subjects themselves are of a very intricate and complex character, in some cases involving very nice distinctions upon the justness or application of which men will often and very

widely differ, and passages of the evidence as to many of them cannot be easily selected and separated from their context, without risk of apparent injustice to one view of the subject or the other.

“The evidence is mainly that of the heads and of those who either were at the time of our inquiry or had been formerly students of the college. No other evidence, indeed, could be of much value; the question being, what was actually taught, and not what was contained in the text-books, which, as already stated, cannot be appealed to as proof of the teaching.

“We have, however, had the opportunity of receiving the testimony, on these and some other points, of parties who, having formerly been students in Maynooth, have become ministers of the Established Church, and entertain views adverse to the religious teaching of the college. We do not propose, as we said before, to discuss the evidence on this branch of the inquiry. We should, however, be doing injustice to the college, if we failed to report, as the general result of the whole evidence before us, that we see no reason to believe that there has been any disloyalty in the teaching of the college, or any disposition to impair the obligations of any unreserved allegiance to your Majesty.” (Report p. 64.)

We would gladly append to this statement of the Commissioners a few extracts from the clear and explicit expositions of their teaching upon those subjects with which the evidence of the professors abounds, and which demonstrate the compatibility of the highest views of Church authority with the most scrupulous discharge of every duty of loyalty and citizenship. We would gladly place their frank and open expositions in contrast with the vague and uncircumstantial, though malevolent insinuations—the “general impressions,” the “obscure recollections” of things “laid down in some portion of some volume,” of the Priests’ Protection Society’s witnesses.* But it would carry us

* Mr. Butler admits, p. 338, that the Maynooth clergy, “although some may be hot-headed, and may take a lead in politics, yet, generally speaking, are as loyal men as the clergy educated abroad;” and that “the Maynooth clergy in the diocese to which he belonged were well conducted and orderly, as subjects of her majesty.” He also stated that he considered them “more straightforward, honourable, avowed and declared opponents of Protestantism.” In a subsequent part of his examination (Answ. 141.) he declared that he is satisfied that the sixth precept of the Decalogue “is not taught or explained at Maynooth in the manner in which it is generally represented” by the opponents of the institution.

quite beyond the limits of such a paper as this to enter into that contrast ; and we can only give a sample of the sort of evidence on which the attempt to impeach the loyalty of Maynooth is made to rest, and of the shuffling ignorance, recklessness, and vague generality by which it is characterized. If, as it is to be presumed, the Priest's Protection Society selected their best men to give evidence before the Commission, they may well congratulate themselves on the acquisition of those "weeds of the Pope's garden." The witness to whom we shall refer is the Rev. Daniel Leahy, of Bermondsey, who describes himself as "clerical superintendent of a society in London, called the English Church Missions to Roman Catholics." We pray attention especially, on the one hand, to the boldness of this witness's assertion, that disloyal impressions were constantly created and kept up in the student's mind ; and, on the other, to the shallow subterfuges by which he seeks to evade the demand on the part of the examining commissioner, for specific explanations as to the manner in which this impression was created ; still more to his melancholy exhibition of ignorance, when tested as to the teaching of the college on those precise points, where, if at all, these subjects must necessarily have been discussed. When pressed in this way he "could not call to mind;" he "had some indistinct recollection:" he "rather thought;" he "could not say positively;" he "had some glimmering of it;" his "recollection was not clear at present;" he "took it for granted;" it "was laid down in some of the works;" he "did not know whether it was Delahogue or Bailley;" he "thought he recollected that it was laid down in some portion of some volume!" And when driven to acknowledge that he could not recollect any such teaching at all, he had the baseness to attribute their abstinence therefrom to the fear of forfeiting the annual grant of eight or nine thousand pounds !

"Was the question of the allegiance which is due to the Royal Majesty treated of in the course of the instruction you received?—No ; I do not recollect any instructions on that point.

"In the class-books, is there any part which particularly bears upon that point?—No ; not that I am aware of at present.

"Did you go through the whole of Dr. Delahogue's work?—A portion of that work was read in the several Theology classes through the house. I went through the regular course of the house. Dr. Delahogue and Bailly were the class-books ; but I do

not bring to my recollection anything with regard to any instruction about the duties of allegiance in them. On the contrary, the impression is constantly kept up in the minds of the Students that the reigning king at any time was a heretic, and out of the pale of salvation, and that they could not conscientiously have what they call allegiance to him, so as to keep him on the throne to the exclusion of a Roman Catholic, inasmuch as it would be injurious to the eternal welfare of his soul. That was, as far as I could form an opinion, the general impression.

“In what way was that impression conveyed?—I do not recollect any instruction with regard to allegiance being delivered at any time. I only give my own impression, and my opinion is, too, that that was the general impression of the body of the students in the house.

“Do you mean that you are now conveying the impression which you have of the opinion generally entertained by the Students?—Yes, I think so.

“Is it your intention to convey any impression as to the instruction that was received?—No; I do not call to mind any instruction with regard to the duties of allegiance that I heard or received at Maynooth. I think the students are generally under the influence of their own prejudices, and the teaching of the Roman Catholic doctrine, which is, of course, clearly, that all persons outside the pale of the Church of Rome, are in a state of reprobation and exclusion.

“Did you ever hear any teaching which inculcated that, by reason of being a heretic, the Sovereign was not entitled to allegiance?—No; I do not recollect. Maynooth, in my time, was supported by an annual grant of £8,000, or £9,000 a year; and I think it would be going rather too far if they inculcated anything of that kind. I think they steered clear of any direct instruction with regard to that; because they could not give any instruction that would clash with the teaching of the Church of Rome.

“In point of fact there was none?—No, I do not remember. I cannot call to mind any instruction with regard to allegiance.

“In Dr. Delahogue’s Treatise ‘De Ecclesia,’ there is this passage—‘Christus Petro et successoribus ejus aut Ecclesiæ nullam concessit potestatem directam vel indirectam in Regum temporalia.’ Do you recollect that passage being made the subject of a lecture or comment, during your whole course of study?—I cannot at present distinctly call to mind whether I heard that subject discussed in class or not; but I have some indistinct recollection of it. Delahogue was not the professor in my time, his book was only the class-book—the professor in my time, ‘De Ecclesia,’ was Dr. O’Hanlon. I rather think—I cannot say positively—that it may have been the individual opinion of Dr. O’Hanlon, very cautiously given, of what is stated here.

“Do you mean to say that you are of opinion that possibly that passage was brought forward, and that the doctrine contained in it

was inculcated?—Yes ; I think that the *professor held that opinion himself* ; but that *the general opinion* was that the Pope had direct power over kings and monarchs, inasmuch as that their souls, and the souls of their subjects, were so much more valuable than any worldly possessions, and that everything should come to the utility of the Church finally—to forward that end, to wit, the salvation of their souls.

“ You refer still, do you not, rather to the impressions that were prevalent among the students, than to what was the actual course by the professor from the Chair?—Yes, I do.

“ According to your recollection, the doctrine contained in that extract was taught by Dr. O’Hanlon?—I said that *I had some indistinct recollection* of that question being discussed in class, and that my belief would lead me to think that Dr. O’Hanlon’s private opinion, in giving it to the class, was that the Pope had no direct temporal power over kings or monarchs.

“ And that he taught that in the class?—*That that was his own private opinion*, but I cannot, with any certainty, assert its being taught in class. I have *some glimmering* of it. My recollection is not clear at present regarding *any particular discussion* on a question of that kind.

“ Your impression is that it was taught by him, conveying it as his own opinion, and inculcating it in the class?—Yes, I think so.

“ Have you any recollection of an opposite opinion to that being at all taught by him, or by any of the Theological Professors?—No ; but that it was laid down in *some of the works*. I think I recollect that it was laid down in *some portion of some volume, either of Bailly or Delahogue*, that the Sovereign Pontiff had, indirectly, a supreme power over all kings and monarchs, inasmuch, as to anything that would impede the salvation of their souls, that he had the power of annulling or dispensing with it ; and the prominent idea on the minds of the students was, the universal supremacy of the Pope ; and the distinction (*now that my mind is becoming more clear on it*) that was made was this, as regards his temporal power ; that he had not, directly, temporal power in other kingdoms ; but it followed indirectly, by reason of his absolute power over their souls. I think *that was the doctrine that was taught by several of the professors* in Maynooth.

“ Do you recollect a particular part in Bailly’s Treatise on Moral Theology, in which the duties of subjects towards their prince are enforced?—I do recollect that *there were such things treated of in the books* ; but, afterwards, when a priest comes to perform functions on the Mission, it is more the moral and practical portion of that class-book that he attends to.

“ You do not recollect that, whether in treating these Chapters, the duties of a subject in regard to his allegiance, were fully entered upon?—I do not remember whether we went through them at all.

Of course I take it for granted that we did do so."—Report, pp. 300—1.

The charge as to the indecency of certain portions of the teaching of the college is a more painful one, and one which, in the hands of gross-minded and unscrupulous assailants, has been used with far greater effect. We have already stated that this, as bearing directly upon the ministerial training of the candidate for the priesthood, is a subject into which the Commission was clearly precluded by the Acts of Parliament from entering. The doctrine of Maynooth College in this particular is not peculiar to itself; it is not peculiar to the Catholic Church as it exists in Ireland. It is the same in every portion of the Catholic world—the same substantially in every treatise of Catholic theology. It is, in one word, clearly a point affecting "the religious doctrine and discipline of the Roman Catholic religion," and, therefore, one reserved exclusively for the Catholic authorities, to whom the superintendence of the college belongs. Nevertheless, we rejoice, that, while the Commissioners recognize it as a subject on which, "from its being intimately connected with certain doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, it is not their province to deliver an opinion," they thought it their duty notwithstanding, to afford the college authorities, by calling their attention to it, an opportunity of rebutting the charges of which it has been made the foundation. Nothing could possibly be more satisfactory than the explanation and defence of their teaching, which the professors of theology have given in their answers to the interrogatory on this head. It will be enough, however, for our purpose to extract the paragraph of the Report, which contains a summary of the views in reference to it, put forward by the professors in these extremely able answers.

"The teaching at Maynooth with respect to those portions of Moral Theology which relate to purity of life, is a topic which we have entered into with great reluctance, partly on account of its own nature which unfits it for public discussion, and partly from its being intimately connected with certain doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church on which it is not our province to deliver an opinion. Apprized, however, as we were, of the serious charges which have been brought against the College on this ground, we have thought it our duty to call the attention of parties connected

with the College to the subject, and to give them an opportunity of making such statements in regard to it as they thought desirable.

“In the first place, they fully admit that in Maynooth, as in all Roman Catholic Colleges for the education of ecclesiastics, a portion of the course of Moral Theology is occupied with the discussion in more or less detail, of sins against chastity, and that the discussion of such subjects is, by the avowal of their most eminent authors, by no means devoid of dangers to the mind and character of the students. But they state, in the first place, that such study is essential for the proper discharge of the functions of the confessional which the Roman Catholic Church considers to be an institution of Divine appointment; that it is deferred until the period of the student’s career, when his approaching entrance on the duties of the priesthood imposes the necessity of acquaintance with the subject; that it is then confined in Maynooth to a very short period (one Professor fixes it at eight days); that the subject itself is always treated of in a learned language, and every security taken which piety and prudence can suggest, that it shall be handled with reverence and reserve, and in no spirit of licentious curiosity,

“We are here bound to say, that we have no reason to believe, from the evidence of any party, that these studies have had, practically, an injurious effect upon the mind and character of the students.”

Even the evidence of the apostate priests itself, through all the malevolence which it evinces, is decisive as to the caution and delicacy with which the subject is treated. “It was not so elaborately looked into,” said Mr. Butler, “as it is represented. There are very severe and very wholesome admonitions; and, if a clergyman stands to them, he has caution enough given him.” (p. 339.) Mr. Leahy “remembered (p. 303.) having heard in the college of some persons who looked upon the subject as so dangerous, that they should read it on their knees in the chapel.” Mr. Burke, (p. 312.) and Mr. Brasbie, (p. 311.) repeat the same fact; and the latter states, that there “was always a prayer before and at the conclusion of every lecture;” that the subject was not lightly treated, but on the contrary, very seriously; that “the students were put on their guard in reference to it;” that they “treated it with great repugnance;” that they looked upon the subject as exceedingly painful and revolting, and carefully avoided all reference to it in conversation. It is true that the witness, Mr. Leahy, of whose shuffling we have already had a tolerable specimen, declares it as his opinion that this teaching had a direct tendency to corrupt the morals of the students; but when

pressed for particulars, and called on to state whether or not there were immoral men among the students whom he knew in Maynooth, "he could only say (p. 306) that he knew about two persons, as he thought, of very carnal minds;" and on being pushed still farther as to these two solitary instances, he confessed that he *thinks they were expelled*; at all events they both left the house, whether expelled or withdrawn he could not say! (p. 307.)

The evidence of these gentlemen, indeed, while it is, as might naturally be expected, full of malevolence against the Church which they have deserted, is far more a subject of merriment than of indignation. We might easily fill pages with most amusing specimens of its absurdity. One of them informed the Commissioners that it is the practice in France and Spain to bury the body of any person who had not communicated at Easter, "at the nearest cross roads, with a stake thrust through it."* The same gentleman assured them that "all Protestants are under major excommunication," (p. 315)—that "England is under an interdict," (ibid.) and that "the effect of an interdict is denying fire and water!" (p. 314.) He told them, moreover, as an evidence of the disloyalty of the students, that it was their habit in chaunting the royal anthem, "Domine salvum *fac* regem," to sing "Domine salvum *whack* Regem!"† (p. 315.) and he evidently looked on this as a most decisive point, for he twice repeats it. (*Answers* 69 and 74.) A further interesting communication of this gentleman was to the effect that "the maniple is the only portion of the priest's dress which is not borrowed from the Pagan priesthood of Numa Pompilius!" (p. 315.) Another of these witnesses, Mr. Brasbie, went still more minutely into the history of the maniple, and told the Commissioners (p. 310) that "it was of Jewish origin, and was worn by the Jewish High-

* Burke's evidence, p. 321.

† Unfortunately for the absurd but malignant story, the students, as is stated by the Rev. Mr. Neville (p. 349), *do not sing this versicle at all*. This, the *versicle*, is entoned *solo* by the master of the choir; the students reply with the *Response*, "*Et exaudi nos in die in qua invocaverimus te,*" but *never, on any occasion, sing, or join in singing, the versicle*. The absurd substitution, unfortunately for the fiction, is simply impossible.

Priest!" He told them that by removing this vestment, the priest ceased to officiate as a priest, and thenceforward prayed only as a layman. And he considered it a clear proof of the unsound teaching of Maynooth, and of its inconsistency with the morality of the Decalogue, that when Sir Robert Peel stated in his place in parliament,* that in Maynooth college, two, and even three students were compelled, under the old grant, to sleep in one bed for want of sufficient accommodation, neither the Presidents nor the professors came forward to deny the fact, because it served a purpose to leave it uncontradicted! (p. 311.)

For the reason stated in the outset of this article, we have confined ourselves to that part of the Maynooth question which bears directly on the relations of Catholics to the state, and to their Protestant fellow-countrymen. To ourselves as Catholics, the subjects which we have passed altogether as less suited for discussion in a Journal like ours, are, we need hardly say, infinitely more interesting and far more intimately connected with the progress and even the maintenance of religion in Ireland. How far the system hitherto adopted in the college is calculated to attain the great ends of ecclesiastical education; whether the education, in so far as regards mere secular learning, has kept pace with the progress of the time; how far the tone and spirit of the religious teaching fulfils all those higher requirements of which, in these days of trial, the common mind of Catholicity is everywhere becoming daily more sensible; how far the spiritual training, not merely realizes the substance of the interior life, but successfully aims at the very refinements of the higher asceticism; how far, in a word, the entire system is calculated to form perfect priests, suited to strive with the varied and new forms of difficulty, intellectual, controversial, or ascetical, which present themselves in modern society;—these are the really vital questions for the consideration of

* It is hardly worth while to say, that Sir Robert Peel never made such a statement. When an absurd story to that effect originated in a jest, made the rounds of the newspaper press, this lamented statesman was at the pains to reprint from Hansard and circulate among his friends, an exact report of the speech as delivered by him on introducing the measure.

Catholics. For the solution of these questions, the evidence contained in the appendix of the Report will supply abundant and most suggestive material, to be used by those whose province it is to decide with authority. We cannot commend too highly the frankness and unreserve with which the witnesses have given their opinion on all these subjects. There is no appearance of effort to make out a favourable case for the college ; no desire to conceal or gloss over what is believed to be a defect ; no reluctance to suggest many large and searching measures of reform ; and we do not doubt that in the hands of the Trustees of the College, the careful and judicious suggestions of the Report and the evidence of many of the witnesses, will turn to a most useful account in the improvement of its condition and the development of its great resources for good.

There are some points upon which there is a unanimous demand for improvement. To raise, at the entrance examination, the standard of proficiency in English and in general information ; to enlarge and continue throughout the course the instruction and also the exercise in literary composition ; to devise a means of maintaining and extending, during the advanced course, the classical and philosophical knowledge of which at present, speaking practically, a final leave seems to be taken at entering into divinity ; to promote the study of the chief modern languages ; to improve and extend the library, which at present appears lamentably defective in these departments ; and to increase the facilities of keeping the students *au courant* with all that is really good and safe in the literature, (especially the historical literature,) of our own times ;—these are objects connected with the literary interests of the college, to the importance of which every one seems fully alive, and which must form the most prominent features in any scheme of improvement which may be devised.

As regards the spiritual training of the students, it is impossible to doubt that, in every essential particular, it is solid and satisfactory ; but in reference to some of its details, a wide difference of opinion appears among the various witnesses. The most remarkable of these regard the extent and the nature of the intercourse between the superiors and the students, and the sub-division of the now overgrown academical body into smaller sections, each

living apart from the rest, and subject to a different government and to a special sort of training. These, we need hardly say, are questions which would be entirely out of place here ; although there is not one of our Catholic readers who must not feel how important are the interests which they involve.

There is one other subject, that of Christian Art in all its branches, to the deficiencies in which more than one of the witnesses strongly alludes, and which we should be forgetful of what, since the first establishment of our Journal, has always been one of the great objects of our teaching, were we to pass by. The subordinate place given to the study and practice of Church ceremonial ; the meagre and unsystematical training which the students receive in ecclesiastical music ; the absence of instruction in the principles of ecclesiastical architecture and decoration ; and the want of proper models for the formation of the taste of the students—to all these the Commissioners allude strongly in their Report. It would be unjust, however, to advert to these striking deficiencies without adding, that, for the most part, they appear to be the natural growth of the state of penury to which the college was condemned under the old parliamentary grant, of which every farthing was unavoidably devoted to the mere material necessities of the students. Since the increased endowment of 1845, the witnesses state that it has been impossible to remedy the evils which had thus arisen under the old system. Owing to the miserably insufficient accommodation of the college buildings then in existence, and their extremely dilapidated condition, the sum granted for building purposes proved to be entirely below the requirements of the college under its new and enlarged conditions. Although the building has been executed at what he considers “a very low rate,” the architect of the Board of Works states that “the amount of accommodation required was so greatly disproportioned to the funds allocated for the purpose, that, although the several buildings, and all the fittings, were designed in a style of the severest simplicity, the Board have been unable to do more than erect a portion of the original design, without furniture or fittings of any kind.” (p. 264.) Most unhappily, for the important objects to which we are now alluding, the portion which they were obliged to omit was the very part which would have included

the chapel and common hall. The community, therefore, increased in numbers as it has been, is still condemned to occupy the mean and inappropriate chapel of the old college. Accordingly, as far as the opportunities of church ceremonial, nay, of the ordinary decencies of worship, are concerned, the students are at present actually at a greater disadvantage than before the enlarged endowment; nor has it been possible, even in the other parts of the college, the class-halls, study-rooms, cloisters, corridors, &c., to attempt anything of that internal decoration which adds so much to the grace and effect of the gothic collegiate buildings which have been elsewhere erected. The petty persecution of withdrawing the vote for repairs has, of course, aggravated this evil. The new building is yet almost entirely destitute even of the commonest necessities of furniture; and the new library, a spacious and elegant room, remains with its walls still bare of shelves; while, in the expectation of a speedy removal to their new site, the books, inconveniently crowded in the old library, have fallen into a state of inextricable disorder.

The Report of the Commission makes it plain that, until the new building shall have been completed by the erection of a suitable chapel, it is idle to hope for such order as is indispensable to the decency and even to the quiet and recollection indispensable for public worship.

These, however, together with the still higher requirements to which we have been alluding, will furnish matter for much and anxious consideration to the Trustees of the College, and the ecclesiastical authorities who are responsible for its efficiency. The Report and Evidence supply ample information, collected not only from the members of the college themselves, but also from many other ecclesiastical establishments in foreign countries. Nor do we doubt that, in the wise discretion of those who are alone responsible, what was originated and designed in a spirit of hostility, will eventuate in the improvement and elevation of the tone, character, and efficiency of the Institution.

ART. IX,—*The Blessed Sacrament, or the Works and Ways of God.*

By FREDERICK WILLIAM FABER, D. D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, Dublin, and Derby: Richardson and Son, 1855.

FATHER Faber's new book on the Blessed Sacrament, will, we venture to predict, go through more editions, and continue to have more readers and more admirers than any work which has yet come from his gifted pen. It is a rare, beautiful, altar-flower, and will long shed a pleasant and holy fragrance to attract many a devout heart, and make it love to linger near the sanctuary. The author tells us that his own desire has been to present it at the feet of the Blessed Sacrament, as a thank-offering, for the gift of faith in that wonderful mystery. It will surely have the effect of inciting others, too, to wish to make their thank-offerings, if not for the gift of faith conferred under extraordinary circumstances, yet for the thousand times ten thousand priceless favours that have flowed to them from the Blessed Sacrament—if not in the shape of a written work requiring genius and learning to produce it, yet, at least, by prayer, and praise, and love.

It is a beautiful characteristic of the Church, that, though since her first establishment, she has been incessantly engaged in deadly warfare for the conservation of the faith, though she has never been allowed a moment's breathing time by the schismatic, or the heretic, or the infidel, yet never has she for one hour relaxed in her sweet care to promote the holiness of her individual children, to multiply among them the fruits of the Holy Spirit, to see that they should aspire to perfection and the most intimate union with God. A conflict so long sustained, so unintermitting, so violent, as that which the Church has been compelled to maintain against the countless hosts who have ever and again continued to assail the faith, would have infallibly absorbed the entire attention and engrossed the entire energies of a society which was not always aided from above. All the fortitude, and vigilance, and vigour, which such society could put forth would scarce be adequate to the work of defence. Its rulers would tell the people that in the time of hot war, with such powerful

foes ever thundering at the gates of their city, the only duty was to man the walls and keep out the invaders. And if, in such a crisis, complaint should be urged that internal improvements were less attended to than usual—that works raised in the better days of peace were suffering from neglect, and some allowed to go to ruin ; that no care was taken to beautify the streets, to extend the influence of the arts, to give an air of greater splendour and majesty to the temples, to invest the administration of justice with more solemnity, to lay out gardens for the recreation of the public, to erect fountains, to open museums, to build palaces of industry, surely such complaint would be considered inopportune and even absurd.

While, however, it is the destiny of the Church to be ever engaged in combat with enemies from without, she is continually appealing to each individual within the fold,—exhorting the sinner to repentance, and inviting the just to greater holiness, with as much earnestness and as much tender solicitude as if the sole object of her mission on earth had been to win each single heart and bind it more closely to God. Thus her providence for her children resembles the divine Providence which watches over all, extending from sea to sea, and not overlooking the least or the vilest. The same Blessed Will which preserves and controls the universe, disregards not the humblest and weakest thing found in it—but controls and preserves it also, guiding it with ineffable condescension to the fulfilment of the end for which it is intended. He never wearies, never relaxes in the work, but provides for each with as much solicitude as if it alone had been created. And such also, in its way, seems to be the loving economy of the Church, Christ having established her to be the symbol and instrument of divine Providence for the salvation of men. However arduous, however manifold, however complicated may be the general ends which she has to attain, her eye ever rests upon the individual, she is ever intent upon the formation and direction of his character, and she employs her resources in moulding his heart and uplifting it to God, as if it constituted the sole sphere of her operations. Is it not, moreover, true, that as in the natural order there are laws, ways, and means given, specially suited to each thing according to its nature and its kind, due provision being made for whatever is found in the scale of being from the insect up to

the archangel ; so also the Church, under the guidance of divine wisdom, shapes and beautifully tempers her ordinances for the direction of souls, knowing well the precise words, and the tone in which she should speak, to all—to the listless wanderer, to the worldly-minded, to the obdurate, to those who have begun to seek after justice, to those who are in the state of grace, to those who would wish to follow Jesus and become perfect, to those whom God has led to sublimest sanctity.

It is extremely curious that even intelligent Protestants will sometimes form such shallow, not to say perverse views of the system adopted by the Church in bringing souls to God. They scarce ever contemplate that system, as a whole, or care to examine whether different parts of it may not be adapted to and intended for the attainment of different purposes. One man hears of the degree of virtue which the Church requires in religious, who are bound by their profession to aspire to the plenitude of Christian perfection and Christian charity, and forthwith he concludes that she will allow none of her children to enter the kingdom of heaven, except upon the same terms. Hence he puts her down for a hard, gloomy-minded, stern step-mother, the friend of a superstitious and cruel asceticism, that places salvation altogether beyond the reach of the bulk of mankind. Another hears that she draws a distinction between venial and mortal sin, and teaches that the sins, black and multiplied of an entire life, may, in an instant, be blotted out by sincere sorrow on the part of the sinner, accompanied with absolution given by a priest, having jurisdiction from the Church, and he exclaims,—they confound good with evil ; they open an easy way to the commission of all crime ; they recognize no real practical difference between a life of virtue and a life of guilt. “ Unto whom shall I liken the men of this generation, and to what are they like ? They are like unto children sitting in the market-place, and speaking one to another, and saying, ‘ We have piped unto you and ye have not danced : we have mourned and ye have not wept.’ For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine, and ye say he hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking ; and ye say, Behold a glutton and a drinker of wine, a friend of publicans and sinners ! And wisdom is justified by all her children.” (Luke vii. 31.)

Protestants almost invariably judge of us from extreme

points. They are all pretty well agreed in recognizing nothing more than a human institution in the Church, but there is a great variety of theories prevalent among them to explain the secret of her long duration and extraordinary success. One class of them will maintain that her success is owing in a great measure to her disregard for moral rectitude, to a system by which sin may be cheaply committed, by which, after death, the soul may go to heaven, though through life the heart has been a stranger to God, and insensible to every generous and holy emotion. Another class insists upon solving the riddle by assuring us that it is the high spiritual tone adopted by the Church, bordering upon, if not touching the mystic, which explains the secret of her power, and they are satisfied that if she were less dexterous in finding an outlet for the enthusiasm, the fanatical aspirations of her children, she could never have attained her present position.

The most numerous as well as the most clamorous section is that, we believe, which affects to perceive in the alleged cheap terms upon which the Church allows a sinner to become reconciled with God: or in the alleged extent to which she allows a Christian to go without being guilty of a grievous violation of the divine Law, an occasion of deep scandal. They are hurried away by a noble zeal and virtuous indignation at sight of a system which they say contains so little of generosity towards God, which chaffers and peddles with conscience about the commission of sin, which teaches nothing to kindle higher aspirations after holiness, and make the Christian heart burn to give all for all. They cannot help hating such a system, they consider it a duty to denounce it, to raise against it the abhorrence of truly pious men, to make it disappear and cease to trouble the earth. With what impetuous zeal do not these men plunge into a volume of St. Liguori's *Moral Theology*, read there a section on equivocation, a section on oaths, and one or two other passages which they had been prepared to decry as of an equally objectionable tendency. With what avidity do they not turn over a page treating of sins of impurity, predetermined to believe that the means prescribed for avoiding them are set down not for that purpose, but simply from a morbid desire, felt by Catholic writers on morality, to brood over scenes of indelicacy and grossness. Pleased with themselves and with the result of their inquiry, they rise up from the brief

perusal and proclaim that they are now acquainted thoroughly with the whole Catholic system, that they know it to be more in accordance with the ethical teaching of the gentile philosophers than with the spirit of sublime sanctity, of heroic self-denial that breathes through the gospel. They have searched it, penetrated it through and through, and they are now in a position to state authentically that in the main and in its details, it is utterly unworthy of a Christian. This is the sum and substance of it, that provided a man is capable of making a dexterous use of double meaning words, he is to be held as ardent a lover of truth as if he were to become a martyr for truth; provided he keeps from the precipice of mortal sin, he may flatter himself that his love of God is as intense as if he were a Protestant who would tremble at the shadow of the most trivial deliberate fault. Is not St. Liguori canonized and worshipped in the Catholic Church? If there were a higher morality to be taught he surely would have propounded it, yet in the estimation of Protestants and of all unprejudiced judges he seems to be intent only upon curtailing every duty to a minimum, directing men not to aspire after higher degrees of holiness, but instructing them in the best way to reconcile the greatest amount of indulgence with a well grounded security that they are still in favour with God. Be my soul with the saints, the protestant of tender conscience will say, but not with such easy theologians.

Another caviller, a disciple perhaps, of Bentham, who has been taught to compare carefully the merits of the systems of utility and asceticism, meets with a Catholic book on ascetic divinity, and forms his idea of Catholicity in general from the perusal of its contents. He is an enemy of the ascetic principle—a thorough utilitarian. The spirit of the Catholic religion, he says, unfits men for business, for the discharge of the common duties of life; it tends only to make them enthusiasts and mystics. It breathes romance; it should be confined to the Happy Valley, for it is constantly intent upon fitting out wings to enable poor mortals to soar above earth, and those who are deluded by it can scarce hope to escape the fate of the dreamer in the story of Rasselas. Of what use is all this austerity, and self-abnegation which it inculcates? Is it not utopian to ask reasonable beings to renounce riches for poverty, liberty for obedience, to place a limit to lawful pleasures,

to desert the theatre, to restrain the senses which God gave us for our benefit, to make long meditations, to kneel for an hour before an altar, believing all the time that we are in presence of our best friend, our benefactor, Saviour, God? Surely if Father Faber had continued a member of the Anglican Church, he could have turned his rare gifts of intellect to better account. He would never have been betrayed into the expression of such exaggerated sentiments. The ideas now contained in his books are not natural. He has unconsciously derived them from his habitual study of the lives of the Romish saints, who by an innate enthusiasm of character, an irresistible idiosyncrasy, perhaps by the laws of their organization, were led to desert the plain paths of duty in order to pass their days on a pillar, or in a cell.

To an assailant fixing his attention upon a single view, and this an extreme one, there may not be wanting reasons specious and manifold not to justify, but to give colour to certain restrictions upon the economy which is employed by the Church in conducting the great business of salvation. In fact, the character and multiplicity of the relations which she assumes towards the individual, while, in reality, it should be taken as the best proof of the divine wisdom that guides her, must from the nature of the thing, tends to create difficulties and objections in the minds of those who examine her policy or discipline only to condemn them. For it is the mission and aim of the Church, never to desert the individual, but ever to follow him through every state of supernatural being, and ever to supply him with the precise helps suited to his condition. Such is her ministry on earth. To what different ends does she not, for example, employ her religious orders. We do not allude now to those who have been engaged in doing battle for the faith, or to those who have sent members to far off lands for the purpose of making the name of Christ crucified known to the Infidel, but to those who had devoted their energies in the bosom of the fold itself to the prevention or curtailment of sin, and the increase of holiness. Some find the sphere for their exertion in the hamlets, some in the towns, some by the sick bed, others amid scenes of buoyant life, some love to labour among the poor and illiterate, others seem instruments chosen specially by Providence for effecting good among the rich, the learned, the high-born. Even after the sinner is cor-

rected, and has begun to walk in the ways of justice, the Church still ever sweetly tries by a thousand devices to allure him to greater heights of sanctity and perfection. And her theology and sacred literature are but a reflection of her ministry. If she sanctions the use of “casuistry,” and commands those who are to hold jurisdiction from her in the confessional, to make themselves acquainted with works of moral theology, like St. Liguori, it is because such knowledge is absolutely indispensable for the spiritual guidance of the vast masses of her children. For the masses of her children, even with all the advantages that encompass them are constantly falling into sin; for the purpose of lifting them out of that state and reconciling them to God, she requires that her priests should, at least in cases of ordinary occurrence, know the law and be competent to pronounce how far the act may be a violation of it. Without such knowledge how could the priest stand towards the penitent in the relation of director—counsellor—physician? Hence, to take a scientific work on moral theology, intended exclusively for the instruction of confessors as the sole standard of Catholic morality, would be to form a most partial and most unjust estimate of the Church’s economy in conducting the affair of eternal salvation. Her principal aim, no doubt, is to look after the fulfilment of precepts, but this anxiety detracts not from her zeal in encouraging also the observance of the counsels. The most cursory inspection of any approved work on ascetic divinity will supply abundant proof of her present desire to promote growth in holiness, and make those who have once entered on the path advance daily more and more towards perfection. We have delayed too long in placing before the reader some account of the work before us.

We shall begin with the opening passage.

“Jesus veiled, in His own great mystery of love, offered by our priests, dwelling on our altars, feeding our souls,—this is the sacred and venerable truth which we are now about to consider. The wisdom of the Cherubim cannot fathom the depths of this adorable Sacrament, neither can the burning love of the Seraphim adequately praise the inventions of compassion which are contained therein. Nevertheless it is our duty as well as our privilege to look into this mystery. It is our daily Sacrifice, and our perpetual Food, and our constant adoration: and the more we know of it the greater will be our love of that most dear Lord whose veiled Presence we

possess therein ; and to know Jesus a little more and then to love Him a little more, let the little be ever so little,—is it not worth a long life of sadness and of care ? Mother Church will give us her hand in traversing these mysterious regions of Divine Truth. She will set holy doctors round about our path, like so many guardian angels, to keep us from going astray, and to tell us the right thoughts to think and the right words to use ; while she herself, by many a touching ceremony, and many a deep wise rubric, will fill us full of sacred fear and of that awe-stricken reverence which befits the enquiry into so deep a mystery. The voice of her great son St. Thomas Aquinas still lives in her office, now with a single antiphon unlocking whole abysses of Scripture, and now in almost supernatural hymns uniting the strictness of dogma with a sweetness and melody more like echoes of heaven than mere poetry of earth. Jesus Veiled ! let us kneel down before Him in adoring awe, while our Mother teaches us His beauty, and His sweetness, and His goodness, and His nearness. When we think we know Him we shall not know the half, and when we speak of Him we shall stammer as children do, and when our hearts are hot with love of Him, they will be cold in comparison of the love which is His due.”—pp. 17-18.

We are also in the Prologue presented with a beautiful glowing description of the holy joy which animates the entire Church on the feast of Corpus Christi. From how many thousands of altars does not the odour of sacrifice ascend like a sweet incense on that day. Everywhere there are processions and benediction,—everywhere there are made acts of love, and of thanksgiving, and of reparation ; the season itself yields its choicest flowers to deck the sanctuary, and be strewn beneath the feet of the Blessed Sacrament. But the curse of heresy lies heavily upon London,—and while the whole Christian world is testifying its faith in, and its gratitude for, this transcendent mystery, the great city gives no outward sign of joy, but goes on in its worldly way, as if nothing had occurred, exhibiting its devotion to no God but mammon. For the Catholic there is something peculiarly glorious, peculiarly triumphant, in the Feast of Corpus Christi. On most other festivals the devotion of the Church is marked by a sense of sorrow for sin, or of desolate grief, such as is the grief of exile ; but on this feast there is no token of sadness—no sign of mourning,—sin itself seems to be forgotten ; like the Hebrew woman of old, our holy mother takes off her haircloth, and arrays herself in the garments of her gladness, and adorns herself with all her ornaments. In

its source and in its intensity her triumph for that day is peculiar, for she exults not because of enemies vanquished—not because of tranquillity and peace possessed—not because in looking back upon her long venerable history she sees so many heresies subdued,—so many kingdoms conquered to the faith,—not because even of her anticipations of bliss—of the happy time when war and exile shall be no more; but she triumphs in the glorious faith, that even here on earth she really and truly possesses, and adores, and feeds upon Him whose Presence is Heaven.

The reader of the first book, in which Father Faber shows that the Blessed Sacrament is the greatest work of God, can hardly fail to remark, that is, if he should at all allow himself to pause for criticism, the singular combination of mental qualities which must have been required to write it. An intimate acquaintance with ascetic divinity every one would be prepared to expect, but Father Faber's knowledge of scholastic theology seems quite as comprehensive and as accurate. And as we read further through the work, the minuteness and extent of this knowledge are still more clearly evinced. It is his use, however, of scholastic theology, which, in our opinion, constitutes the most novel, as well as the most interesting feature of the entire volume. To any one except a professed theologian, the subjects of school controversy connected with the Blessed Sacrament would, as they are handled by Lugo, or even by Bellarmine, appear extremely knotty, and but for the transcendent character of the mystery of which they are the natural corollaries, extremely uninviting. It would, at first sight, seem highly improbable that even by most intense and prolonged meditation, the introduction of questions whose solution depends to a great extent upon, or at least involves to a great extent, the exercise of logical subtlety, and the use of a hard technical phraseology, could be made to inspire the most fervid eloquence, and elicit almost seraphic strains of devotion. Yet, so it is in Father Faber's work on the Blessed Sacrament. Most of our readers are acquainted with that sublime *Rhythmus* on the Eucharist, which, if he had never written anything else, would have sufficed to indicate the rare assemblage of high qualities in the intellect of St. Thomas, and to have made his name immortal in the literature of the Church. The humble faith of the simplest Christian—the learning

of the greatest of theologians—the sagacity of the angel of the Schools, were united with a poetry that breathes echoes not of earth, but of heaven, to open for us the depths of that mystery, and make us at least understand sufficiently well to be convinced that it is the most wonderful and most adorable of God's works, and, indeed, a compendium of all His works. If we conceive that *rhythmus* translated into some of the most beautiful prose in the English language, by one who could seize upon and appreciate the spirit of the hymn, we will have, perhaps, an idea of the plan of a portion of Father Faber's work. Not that Father Faber's work is not eminently original,—indeed, its originality, as we have said, is one of its most remarkable characteristics; but the happy blending of accurate theological exposition with an eloquence almost poetic, and a rapt spirit of devotion, can scarce fail to suggest a similitude between the two,—such as might be supposed to exist between an inspired canticle, and a discourse of St. Ephrem, embodying, expanding, and illustrating the same thoughts.

We have heard exception taken to the “*Works and Ways of God*,” on the ground that it is too theological—that it abounds to an inconvenient extent in doctrinal descriptions. We cannot concur in this view. That it contains more matter of a strictly theological character than is to be ordinarily found in our devotional books is obvious enough; but whether a book on such a subject would be better without the introduction of such matter,—at all events whether it be not extremely desirable that we should have a popular manual, laying before our eyes the multitude of wonders which God has wrought for us in the Blessed Sacrament, is a very different question. It is our deliberate opinion that the larger number of correct ideas we have concerning the Blessed Eucharist, the more intense must become our veneration for such an august mystery, and the more profound our gratitude for such a loving invention. And with this remark premised, we have less difficulty in saying that we did ourselves, upon the first rapid reading of some portions of the work, find ourselves yielding to a kind of instinctive belief that there were several points broached in the introduction which we did not deem to be exactly objectionable, but which, at first sight, it seemed to us might have been judiciously omitted. Thus, it occurred to us, not that the number of

miracles which are wrought in the Blessed Eucharist should have been less dwelt upon, but that the way in which each is described might, at least, by unlearned readers, be considered as almost morbidly scrutinizing—might be understood as too elaborate, not to say bold, an attempt to put aside the veil of the sanctuary, and lay utterly bare the Holy of Holies. Better, we said, if only the broad striking characteristics which lie, as it were, on the surface of this sublimest mystery, had been brought forward; these, surely, in the hands of Father Faber, would have supplied abundant material for effecting the end which he desired—to kindle sweet flames of love in the hearts of his readers, and draw daily more enamoured adorers around the altar. As it is now, curiosity thus excited will but stand in the way of love.

And there are many, we have no small doubt, who, even after a second and third perusal, and even after prolonged reflection, would be disposed to pronounce some such criticism as this, and to find fault with the elaborately detailed minuteness in the handling of doctrinal points which characterises some sections of this extraordinary book. Possibly, they might detect their minds unconsciously recurring to the example of the Divine Teacher Himself, and also dwelling upon the thought of that inspired wisdom which influenced the writers of the Sacred volume to content themselves with an explicit enunciation of this transcendently mysterious dogma, without ever asking us to follow them in probing all its depths, and searching all its hidden wonders. Venerable antiquity, too, might seem to them to raise its voice, and negatively at least to supply grounds for protest against thus attempting to popularize a theme essentially subtle and hard to comprehend. Why did not Chrysostom or Augustine, in their discourses intended for the people, enter upon discussions like those introduced in the “Works and Ways of God?” Who of the Fathers, in a sermon on the Blessed Eucharist, addressed to a mixed congregation, where even it might be supposed that the monk, and the student, and the scholar, stood side by side with the simple faithful,—where there were to be seen the deep philosopher as well as the uncultured man of daily labour,—where the high-born lady knelt next to her who had no inheritance save trust in the Almighty, would have mooted questions relating to the theory of Absolute Accidents, or asked

whether the act of consecration were of the kind denominated adductive or productive? To raise such issues at the proper time, and in the proper place, is of the last importance, but to bring them forward inopportunately, gives them the air of a kind of anatomical process neither pleasant nor useful. The schools are the legitimate sphere for this discipline, and within the precincts of the schools they should be confined.

By way of preparing the reader for the few words we have to say in answer to such remarks, silent or expressed, we will make a short extract or two from the work itself.

“But let us approach the mystery, and regard it more in detail. We must almost hold our breath while we do so, for we are on holy ground, and as it were looking over God and putting our face close to His Hands, fashioning this stupendous work of His omnipotence. There are, as you know, many open questions in the Church regarding this mystery, and which are freely debated with much wisdom and affectionate piety in the schools. It would be out of place here to encumber my pages with controversy, neither can I honestly follow one author only, which would be the easiest thing to do. When then I speak of things which do not fall under the definitions of the Church, and state simply an opinion as the true one, I would not be understood either to set myself up as a judge, or to affix any note of disapproval to the opposite opinion; but simply every student of theology has his opinions, follows one school rather than another, is convinced by this style of argument rather than that, and is biassed by a sort of indescribable instinct, not less devotional than intellectual, to take one particular road across the beautiful empire of theology rather than another. I promise to give only approved and authorized opinions; but I shall not state the objections to them, as I am concerned only with my own convictions, and their devotional consequences, and not at all with controversy.”
—pp. 76-77.

“Has anything been said of the Blessed Sacrament which the truth does not warrant? Has any statement been made which the Church does not either compel us to believe, or point to as an easy inference from her theological definitions? And has it not all been said as drily and prosaically as possible? Yet surely it is a very frightening consideration! Remember, all these great things which we have been thinking of have not to do with some past mystery, like the creation of the world, which took place thousands of years ago, and which we look up to with intellectual astonishment through the dimness of venerable time, and adore the council of the Most Holy Trinity, whose loving wisdom decided on the creation of our race. Neither does it concern a tremendous far-off mystery, like the general judgment, in which we shall all have to

bear our parts, and wherein we do not know how we shall have to behave; and yet so much depends on our behaviour here. We can look at mysteries so long past or so far forward with calmness, or at least without permanent disquietude or serious agitation. But the Blessed Sacrament is a mystery of daily repetition, of ordinary familiarity. We are coming across our Lord continually. Either we are calling Him from heaven ourselves, if we be priests, or we are witnessing that unspeakable mystery, or we are feeding on Him and seeing our fellow-creatures do so also, or we are gazing at Him in His veils, or receiving His benediction, or making our devotions at His tabernacle door."—Pp. 60-61.

Surely it cannot be true that to enter minutely and deeply into the theology of Transubstantiation is to excite a vain curiosity, when the inquiry is conducted ever in a spirit of reverence, humility, and loving faith. For here the poor, narrow, vulgar canons of literary criticism demand a very modified and very peculiar application. To write upon the Blessed Eucharist is not to compose an epic, or tragedy, or history, setting forth human incidents, appealing to human passions, and destined to awaken merely human interests. In this great argument, while guided by the approved teaching of the doctors of the Church, there is no need for anxiety about selecting strong salient points, and throwing others into the background, lest they may perchance be unpalatable to the audience. The region in which we are is faith, the ground over which we walk is all holy. It is not angel, or archangel, or highest seraphim that we meet there, but the Eternal, the Omnipotent, the Infinite. And when faith teaches that it is He, can any increase of our knowledge of Him diminish or arrest the outpourings of our love for Him? If we are taught that the wonders of His condescension are more manifold, deeper, grander, stranger than even we had conjectured, is the intellect only to admire, and the heart to stand still and unmoved? As we are brought nearer to Him, can we think less of Him? Majesty may seem humbled, and, so to speak, in an odd position, but when we believe that it still is Divine Majesty, and is so humbled for us, must not the reflection elicit more generous gratitude, and more fervid adoration?

Let us see if even from the consideration of other matters we may not be able to derive, at least, some imperfect illustration of the way in which devotion to the Blessed Sacrament may be fostered and promoted by a judicious use of

the theology of Transubstantiation. Is it not proverbial that love ever tends to know all about the object beloved? What pious Christian would not wish for a minute biography of his patron saint, provided only he could be sure that it was faithful and accurate? Would any little detail of the life of St. Philip be uninteresting to one of the brethren of the Oratory? And would not a Jesuit go to the ends of the earth, if, from the journey, he could learn a fresh particular concerning Ignatius, or concerning him who died upon the sands? We have seen a young Dominican who had not much money in his pocket, prepared to give ten times its intrinsic value for a book containing some slight information connected with the life of one of the saints of his order; the information was at the time not within his reach, but he was resolved to have it at any price, and not let the book go away into the hands of a stranger. Whence arises the mania for being made acquainted with the most trifling incidents in the private family history as well as in the public career of great men? Because we admire them we naturally wish to know all connected with them, nor does the knowledge in many instances lessen our admiration. Again, if you delight to look at flowers, or to gaze upon the bright stars, a knowledge of botany and of astronomy will but increase your pleasure, or tend to magnify and rivet your wonder. Who thinks the river less broad and deep because its lordliness has induced him to trace its windings; and who, from being apprised how the oak silently grows and matures, conceives it less stately or less beautiful, as he beholds it throwing its hundred arms to the sun? And for mother earth, now clad in her bright gorgeous summer robes, does it make us hang with less rapture over her loveliness, that geology may have unlocked for us some of the secrets buried within her teeming bosom?

In every glorious work of nature, and in every fair creation, is not there something to call forth the operation of a twofold principle within us; one aesthetic, if we may be allowed the use of that word, the other purely scientific? Contemplating such productions, we are borne by an instinctive sense of the beautiful, to yield them the tribute of a spontaneous admiration. We pause not to examine the details, if the thing be really beautiful and true it at once arrests and masters us. A landscape, a painting, a piece of sculpture, a work of architecture, who has not felt

his breath come and go at first view of each and all of them? But then if the landscape or the painting be daily familiar sights, is there not a tendency and a craving to look at them more minutely, to study them, to get, as it were, at the idea embodied in them, and the principle out of which arose the spell that they lay upon us, and by which they bind us? We would fain consider them part after part, till the intellect sees in some way the bearing and proportion of each, and the harmony of all. And if the work, as we said, be a genuine one, true, and fair, and grand, the examination or the analysis can have no other effect than that of heightening our admiration.

Now if the thought which we have been trying to bring out be not a conceit, it would seem to us that Father Faber, in his mode of introducing and of dealing with the quasi doctrinal matters treated of in his book, has adopted some such plan to make the Blessed Eucharist a profoundly interesting theme to his readers, as one skilful to appreciate and dilate upon the properties of a work of nature or of art, commonly finds it convenient to select, when anxious to make others share his own gratification and enthusiasm in contemplating it. He is not content with tracing the outlines. He fancies that the deeper we go into the subject, the doctors and fathers of the Church always guiding us, the more charms and the more attractions will it have for us. And no wonder; for

“all these peculiar excellencies and canons of beauty are united in Transubstantiation, in the Blessed Sacrament; and that in a very remarkable manner. The Incarnation for a fallen race, with the humiliations of our Lord's Thirty-Three years, seemed to carry the divine condescension to the lowest depth. But the Blessed Sacrament contrives to carry it lower still. Its littleness is more wonderful; its ignominies more mysterious; its humiliations more manifold and continual. It is, as we shall see hereafter, an exact parallel of the Incarnation, adding to each branch of that mystery some additional features of loving abasement and inexplicable condescension. No union between the Creator and the creature has been devised so awfully intimate as the sacramental union; neither has the creature in any other mystery been lifted to such a height as that he should be allowed, with a reality so real that no word is forcible enough to express it, to make his Creator his daily Bread. If we wish to select one mystery in which more than another the purely spiritual character of God's operations is peculiarly manifest, there is not one of the faithful who would not on the instant

name Transubstantiation; for spirituality, as our Saviour teaches us in the sixth chapter of St. John, is its very excellence and crown. Where also shall we find continuity more marvellous than that Real Presence of our dear Lord which is to be with us all days even unto the end of the world, or where multiplicity more astonishing than in the number of masses daily all the world over, and the countless multitudes of communicants, and of Hosts reposing in our tabernacles?

“Nowhere shall we find any mystery which shadows forth so many of the Divine Perfections as the Blessed Sacrament, nor with more amazing clearness and minuteness. We have only to look into any of our common theological or devotional treatises to see how completely the faithful have laid hold of and appropriated this consoling truth. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that from the contemplation of the Blessed Sacrament alone we could draw all that we know of God’s goodness and dispositions towards us. If we seek for a disclosure of His love, where shall we find it more strikingly or more touchingly than in the Blessed Sacrament? He loved us ‘to the end,’ as St. John says when he speaks of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, not to the end of His life only, but as commentators explain it, to the end of the possibilities of the divine liberality, to the farthest end that love could go, even His love who was God as well as Man. It is not only gifts and graces which He gives us here, but He is Himself the gift, Himself the grace. Calvary was not enough. The seven Blood-sheddings fell short of His merciful intent. Our ingratitude does not hinder Him. We have spurned His Cross and crucified Him afresh. We have trampled His Blood beneath our feet, and mixed it up with the mire of sin. Now we shall have another mystery in which we may still outrage Him, while He still keeps wooing us to His love. Was ever love like this? Was ever love so great? Was ever love so mournfully unrequited?

“See too how sweetly the wisdom of God is glassed in the mirror of this heavenly mystery! It was the invention of Jesus to stay in the world even when He was quitting it, to be more than ever with His people when He was going away from them to the end of the world, to multiply Himself on earth when He was gone into heaven, and to consecrate the earth with the presence of His Body and Blood when He was elevating them both to their proper place at the Right Hand of the Father, and as it were leaving earth desolate and bare. ‘By the Incarnation,’ says Nouet, ‘the Son of God by a marvellous secret of wisdom found the means of making the invisible visible by covering Himself with our humanity, in order to converse familiarly with us; but in the Blessed Sacrament by a no less marvellous invention He makes the visible invisible, by covering His Sacred Humanity with the appearances of bread and wine, that He may nourish us with His Flesh and Blood. In the mystery of the Incarnation He hides Himself that He may be seen;

in the divine Eucharist He hides Himself that He may be eaten. In the first mystery He lets us see the sweetness of His divinity ; in the second He lets us taste the sweetness of His Humanity. So again all the circumstances of the Blessed Sacrament are full of manifestations of His wisdom. The very concealment of His Flesh and Blood hinders our fear while it defrauds us not of the reality of that stupendous food ; and the very familiarity of the commonplace species which He uses for His veils affords us a delightful exercise of our spiritual discernment and our ardent faith, while He makes Himself easy of access to the whole world by the cheapness and vileness of His disguise.' "—pp. 54-7.

In such a work as the Blessed Eucharist, in which there is so stupendous an assemblage of miracles, a work which transcends even the mysteries of Creation, of Redemption, of Justification, there is that, no doubt, which shrouds the tabernacle with an awful sacredness, and would seem to repel all inquiry which revelation has not expressly answered, or, at least, which necessity does not prompt. We cannot, however, help thinking that the theology introduced in Father Faber's work must have a decidedly excellent effect in promoting devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. It is in no argumentative spirit that he discusses this portion of his subject ; he broaches no novelties, he advances no opinions unsupported by authority. His object is to let us see that though we had imagined we had known something of the ineffable love, and power, and mercy displayed in this august mystery, there is hidden in it infinitely more, which we had not dimly conjectured. And if any reader should allow a sentiment of curiosity to supervene, and usurp the place of reverence, it is not because in those pages he can ever detect the slightest vestige of curiosity, or a momentary forgetfulness of profoundest reverence. It is love, and a desire of exciting love for the Blessed Sacrament in others that seems to have dictated every sentence in the book. And if, as we have said, he who most admires a work of nature or of art delights to linger over it, and he who admires it most intensely to linger over it most fondly, tracing each minutest feature and lineament, dwelling on each variety of light and shade, of form and colouring, is it strange that a priest should employ his learning and eloquence in an effort to communicate to others as detailed a knowledge of the Blessed Sacrament as may be communicated ? If there

be curiosity in this, we repeat that it is the curiosity of love.

We have not spoken up to this of the excellencies which distinguish the work before us. Indeed, Father Faber's reputation as an ascetic writer is now so firmly established, and so wide spread, that without reading the present work at all we should be prepared to form at least a vague anticipation of its principal characteristics. For ourselves, the truth is that we have not ventured to trust ourselves to speak freely of it; we could not commend it as we should wish without seeming to flatter a living author, and to use language which we would not deem just, if to some, at least, it did not sound like exaggeration. We may remark, however, that in a devotional work intended to circulate among the educated classes of our time, it is no small perfection, though, in truth, here a subordinate and comparatively insignificant one, that such conspicuous literary ability should be brought to enhance it. The warfare between light and darkness, between the animal and the spiritual man, between sin and righteousness, between Christ and Belial, has here on earth ever been a hard one, and conducted on unequal terms. Besides, the inherent proneness of nature to evil, evil has ever employed the subtlest agencies, the most specious attractions, the most cunning artifices, to stimulate the perverse tendencies of nature, and aggravate the difficulties that obstruct the triumph of grace. Nature has always had a powerful ally in literature. Intellectual gifts, the rarest and highest, are constantly employed in spreading her dominion, and winning new adherents to her banner. Grace, on the contrary, has but too often been left to carry on the struggle with her cause ill-stated and her weapons ill-constructed. Not that in our own day and in our own country religion has been deserted by genius. She has, indeed, as far as the wide and varied field of controversy is concerned, been defended not merely with wonderful energy and zeal, but with an extent of learning, a power of reasoning, a richness of imagination and of eloquence that would have sufficed not only to make the names of her defenders great as theologians, but to have made them illustrious in any department of literature they might select. As far, however, as devotional works went, we were not, to be sure, deficient in them; yet those we got were rarely of the character we should wish to see realized, but could hardly

expect. They are, for the most part, prosy and jejune, seldom lifting up the heart of the reader, except where the sublime spirituality of the subject itself irresistibly forced it to ascend. One is often forced to travel with them as with a guide-book, not with a living affectionate companion and friend. Reading them you could not, of course, help looking out occasionally to gaze upon the valley, or catch the rose-tint glittering on the mountain, but the authors seemed not to stand side by side with you, and point out with moistened eye or thrilling voice the long deserts of sand, or the Dead Sea, or the streets of the ancient city, or the glory of Thabor, or the peak of Calvary. Not so Father Faber. His enthusiasm and his eloquence remind us of one of the Fathers. Like St. Ephrem, he is perpetually drawing beautiful illustrations from material objects, to make his theme more interesting; his language has some of the rich colouring, as well as the glowing fervour and deep pathos found in the sermons of St. Bernard. Yet we are not allowed to frame and attend to manner or style, the subject itself bears us on and absorbs all attention.

There are some persons, it may be, who will not recognise a perfection or excellence in this mode of writing a spiritual work. They will call it exaggerated, fanciful, unsuited to the peculiar character of a devotional treatise; they will say that it is like setting up luxuriant couches in the church, and placing soft crimson cushions under the knees during time of prayer; they will contend that it is a chimerical or, at least, an unwise attempt to invest the practice of piety, of common-place duty with an air of poetry and romance, an attempt, they may perhaps add, not entirely exempt from the danger of making faith degenerate into a sentiment and an exercise of the imagination.

The most satisfactory reply to such observations is to be found in the perusal of the work itself. We do not remember to have ever read a book on the same subject more thoroughly and more eminently poetical. There is not a particle of false or spurious sentiment from the title-page to the conclusion, any more than there is in Chalmers's *Meditations*, or Gobinet's *Instructions for Youth*.

Our space allows us to give but an extremely meagre analysis of some portions of this interesting work.

Father Faber occupies the second book with a beautiful delineation of the various ways in which the Blessed

Sacrament is made an object of special devotion by Catholics. And in that sweet manner, so peculiarly his own, he shows how the tabernacle becomes a source of spiritual delight and of holy attraction to the pious soul—whether the same be contending with the busy world, or enjoying the tranquillity and repose of a cloister. Sometimes this devotion becomes so great that it absorbs the mind, and leaves it incapable of attending to passing events. Sometimes it so masters the affections, that when its object is once removed, all becomes a sad and dreary waste. Then, again, for certain contemplative persons, the Blessed Sacrament is an epitome of all God's wonders and mercies—a book, in which are legibly written the sublimest mysteries of our holy faith. So far has this love for Jesus in the Holy Eucharist mastered some of his special friends, that it eventually seems to have become a part of their very nature. Some have from God the wonderful gift of discerning, by a certain supernatural instinct, where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved. Others can detect, by the mere taste, a consecrated from an unconsecrated Host,—and some have been known to be attracted to the “Tabernacle of our Hidden Love,” by an indescribable fragrance exhaled therefrom. There are instances on record of some having been communicated by our Lord Himself, or by His angels. “All these,” observes the writer, “are so many developments and disclosures of a special devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, which are quite distinct from the direct and necessary worship of it, which is an essential part of the Christian religion, and cannot be confounded with it. They are particular badges, which distinguish particular good persons from the great multitude of the good.” The utility of these special devotions is then pointed out. They are justly termed “indications of a secret but undeniable attraction of the Holy Ghost,” by which He sweetly disposeth and leadeth to Himself chosen souls, according to their own peculiar tendencies and temperaments. All this is intended to explain and illustrate how there may be such a thing as a special devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, in the technical sense of the word, as well, also, as how it exists distinctively in the Church with manifold and various manifestations. Besides, the Holy Eucharist, along with being the object of the divine worship due to God, assumes as a special devotion of Catholics, its position alongside—nay, even

ranks above—the mysteries of the Divine Infancy, the Passion, the Five Wounds, the Sacred Heart, and the many others which our holy faith reveals. 'Tis in this light it is considered in the book of which we are treating.

“ Special devotions, whether they spring from a natural turn of mind and a peculiar bent of disposition, or from the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, in both cases alike, though not equally so, exercise an important sway over the whole spiritual life. It is quite true that the varied riches of Catholic devotion, as it were, allure our souls to God, and fix their restlessness, while they also satisfy that desire for change, and turn aside that weariness of uniformity, which are infirmities of our nature, infirmities pursuing us even into the sanctuary and meddling with our most intimate communications with God. But this is by no means the whole account of them, notwithstanding that such functions as have been named are of no slight consequence to our sanctification. Special devotions are something more than pious whims or man's devotional idiosyncrasy. They have an inward life of their own, a strong hidden spirit, whereby they can impress a positive spiritual character, peculiar to themselves, upon our souls. They are more than the beauty of holiness ; they are part of its life. They do not blossom only ; they bring forth fruit, and that abundantly. It is very often difficult to find the intrinsic connection between themselves, and the fruits they bear. It often eludes intellectual discovery ; but the fact that there is such a connection is not the less certain, and all pious persons who look much into themselves are well aware of its existence. We know a plant by its leaf and form and the tint of its foliage, and we know from past experience whether its yet unopened buds will be yellow, red or blue in blossom, and we often wonder at the hidden virtue which makes plants of the same family at once so various and so uncertain in the colour of their tints, and in the distribution of the patches of colour. Just so it is with special devotions. They are of much more importance in manufacturing saints, than outward circumstances for the most part are. Indeed in the case of the greatest number of contemplative saints they have the work all to themselves. One devotion produces one kind of a saint, another devotion another ; and a mixture of devotions equally represents in the developments of holiness the proportions of those which composed it. God has given to one devotion to convey one grace, or to concur in the formation of one habit of virtue, or to lead to one kind of prayer ; while others are equally but differently gifted in all these respects. Thus, in those many cases in which no particular attraction of grace seems to be discernible, it forms no unimportant part of spiritual direction to guide pious souls judiciously in the choice of their devotions, and to enable them to extract from each devotion, as bees draw honey

from the flavours of the flowers, that particular spirit with which God has been pleased to endow it. The first question to be asked about any devotion concerns the spirit which it conveys to the soul, the grace it has received for its own, the character, like a sacramental character, which it impresses and seals upon our entire spiritual life. If then the Blessed Sacrament be the subject of a special devotion, we must first discern its spirit, before we can fall in love with its beauty, or give ourselves up to the effects of its power.

“ The spirit of the Blessed Sacrament is plainly twofold, according as we look at the Sacrifice or the Sacrament. The spirit of the Sacrifice is without doubt the spirit of Calvary, for it is a renewal of the mysteries of the Passion, and it is itself the very same Sacrifice. But this is hardly the subject with which we are concerned. It is true that in one sense of the words persons may have a special devotion, meaning thereby a peculiarly great one, to the Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass; but it is scarcely true that, in the other sense of the words, the Mass can be the subject of a separate special devotion to Catholics. It enters too much into our duties, obligations, and the essence of the whole system of the Christian religion, which is eminently a religion of Sacrifice. It is the spirit of sacrifice which creates the Church, maintains it, multiplies it, holds it together, and circulates through its veins as its life's blood. Sacrifice is the key to the difficulties of its dogmas; it is the soul of its mysteries, the cause of its asceticism, the pattern of its mystical unions with God. Ritual is the action of sacrifice, prayer is the language of sacrifice, contemplation is the thought of sacrifice, and interior mortification is sacrifice itself. Sacrifice is to the Church what the soul is to the body; it is whole in the whole body, and whole in every part of the body, and whatever part of the body has ceased to be informed by it, has thereby ceased to be a living part of the body at all. Where there is no Mass, there is also no Christianity. Wherever we turn there is sacrifice. The outward life of the Church is nothing but a glorious and unmistakeable preaching of sacrifice: the papacy is itself only an incessant, continuous, unflinching martyrdom. To the discerning eye, the Church has never left the catacombs, or if it has, it has been only to seek for new ways of suffering, as St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi says that our Lord finding all delights in heaven, save the jewelled stole of suffering, left heaven and the bosom of the Father to come on earth to seek it. If we penetrate into the inner life of the Church, her solitudes of divine union, her peopled deserts of silent love, her cloisters of vowed and supernatural loveliness, the further in we penetrate the more do we discover that it is nothing but a concentration, a transformation, a spiritualizing, of sacrifice. All this lies in the vital force and omnipotent energy of the Mass. That far reaching Sacrifice is everywhere, and does everything for every one. It belongs therefore too much to the existence of the

Church to be the subject of what we call a special devotion, one of many, something which can be compared with other things, a shining mystery with other mysteries shining round about it. The wants of souls are almost infinitely various ; some have the grace to feel the want of much, and to be ever wanting more ; others unhappily want little, and can be contented with almost less ; but just as the running stream fills the vessels great or small which are dipped into its abundance, and just as the sun gives full light to the various powers of vision of different men and animals, so is it with the Mass. It is coextensive with the wants of all, embraces all, satisfies all, stimulates all. Our all is there, our bread for the day, our viaticum for the journey to eternity. It is enough if the daily Sacrifice of the Mass cease, for the Church at once to fall on those unutterable latter days when Antichrist shall persecute and reign. Laws against Mass, insults to it, inabilities to bequeath foundations for it, all these are of the essence of persecution. In the same way that all souls are equal, so mass is equal to all ; and in the same way that every degree of mental power and glorious giftedness, from the sublimest intelligence of the theologian to the limited understanding of the peasant, is secured and sustained, as much as it wants and no more, by the immortal soul, so the broad edifice of the Saint's sanctity and the small beginnings of the sinner's efforts have all they want, and no more, in the Sacrifice of the Mass. The adorable Sacrifice fills all spiritual depths and shallows ; it is its gift that it should fill wherever it is ; fulness is its prerogative. Hence its character does not admit of its being precisely the subject of a special devotion.

“ When we speak, therefore, of the Blessed Sacrament being the subject of a special devotion we mean, not the Sacrifice, nor the Communion, but the Sacramental Life of our Lord, the residence of Jesus amongst us under the mystic veils of the species. The presence of God is at it were the atmosphere of the spiritual life, and the practice of His Presence includes and combines all the practices of devotion ; and just as God's putting on a visible nature in the Incarnation enabled men to picture Him to themselves and to avoid idolatry, so to many souls the practical though not absolute omnipresence of the Sacred Humanity in the Blessed Sacrament supplies them with a practice of the Divine Presence, which in their case far surpasses what they could attain by endeavouring to realize the spiritual presence of God. The Blessed Sacrament does for the immensity of God, what the Incarnation does for His invisibility. It is this life of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament which is the subject of a special devotion.”—pp. 138-143.

The affinity between the Sacred Infancy of Jesus and His hidden life under the sacramental veils is exquisitely traced. And that this is no mere fanciful creation of the writer's own, is clearly proved from the fact of the Church

having always recognized it in her offices, her hymns, and even in the liturgy itself; the Preface of the Mass for all feasts of the Blessed Sacrament being that which is read on the feast of the Nativity. In the Sacred Infancy is found the mystery of the Incarnation, as a prominent and a leading idea. We cannot realize it so successfully in the Passion. "The devotion to the Blessed Sacrament resembles that to the Sacred Infancy. It has the same character of unity, the same varying and diversifying of a single idea, a single mystery; and, moreover, the idea and the mystery in the one are the same as in the other, namely, the incarnation, not in its results, not in its blessings, not in its magnificent developments, but in its simple beautiful self."

Next, the analogy between the Blessed Sacrament and the Annunciation, with its concomitant mysteries, is pointed out in the most exquisite terms. It were better to let the author himself speak.

"Others have regarded it as the fountain of the Rosary and dwelt rather upon the stupendous mystery of the Incarnation itself. One moment, and the Virgin blood of Mary was all her own. The immaculate maiden had not been clothed with the solitary prerogative of virgin Maternity. Another moment, and the Sacred Body had been instantaneously fashioned from her purest blood by the Holy Ghost Himself, perfect in every limb, symmetrical in every proportion, exquisitely formed for the keenest and the most overwhelming suffering, and in all respects beautiful exceedingly. One moment, and the great empire of nothingness lay before the silent power of God, and no word was spoken over its dim and vast abysses. Far and wide lay the dark illimitable regions of possible creatures, but there was no stir in their stagnant and obscure depths. Another moment, and more resplendent than the light of heaven, more beautiful than all the spiritual and intellectual beauty of the countless angels, more majestic than the manifold mysterious pomps of all creation beside, sprung forth from nothing the Human Soul of Jesus. One moment, and the Eternal Word was being eternally begotten of the Father, and from Him and from the Father the Holy Spirit was eternally and ineffably proceeding. All created natures were utterly separate and distinct from Him, neither had He assumed any of them to Himself, nor descended to be, so to speak, a part of His own creation. But in one and the same moment, so instantaneously that except in mere imagination no atom of time came between, no swiftest, divinest and most lightning-like succession, but in one and the same identical moment the Holy Ghost had fashioned that Body from Mary's blood, and

the Soul of Jesus had sprung from nothing and had animated and informed that wonderful Body, and the Body and the Soul found no need of a human subsistence, for in that one same identical moment the Person of the Eternal Word had assumed them to Himself, and He was one Person with two natures, and the blissful Virgin was more incomparably virgin than before, and was a Mother too, the Mother of the Eternal God; and the tingling silentness of the quiet midnight filled the little room at Nazareth that night in March, and the unconscious stars drifted across the sky, and the lily was closed and sleeping in its vase, and the watch-dogs of the herdsmen of Nazareth broke ever and anon the stillness of the night, while the awful mystery was being accomplished. Morning rose on the earth, cold, clear, vernal; and the long-expected Redeemer of mankind had come, and no one but the Mother knew.

“Change the scene for a moment to the catholic altar. It is the mid-silence of the great function. One moment, and there is bread in the priest’s hands, and wine, the fruit of the grape, in the chalice on the corporal. One moment, and there is the substance of bread, with its accidents inherent in it, and it would be the grossest of idolatries to offer any manner of worship to that senseless substance. One moment, and the Body of our Lord is at the Right Hand of the Father, receiving in the splendour of its ravishing magnificence the worship of the prostrate hierarchies of heaven. Another moment, and what was bread is God. A word was whispered by a creature, and lo! he has fallen down to worship, for in his hands is his Creator, produced there by his own whispered word. One moment, and at the bidding of a trembling frightened man, omnipotence has run through a course of resplendent miracles, each more marvellous than a world’s creation out of nothing, not as swiftly as a well-skilled finger sweeps down the keys of an instrument, but unspeakably more swiftly; for here there has been no succession: in one and the same identical moment the whole range of these miracles was traversed and fulfilled. There is the selfsame Body which the Holy Ghost fashioned out of Mary’s blood. There is the selfsame Soul that sprung in the fulness of its beauty from the sea of nothingness. There is the selfsame Person of the Eternal Word who in Mary’s womb assumed that Body and that Soul to Himself. Only, in this is the altar more wonderful than the room at Nazareth, that here many times a day, and on tens of thousands of other altars from the northern fringes of everlasting snow to where the exuberant foliage of the tropics droops into the warm seas, and simultaneously on thousands of altars at once, this stupendous mystery is accomplished; and through the instrumentality, not of a sinless mother, but of unworthy faulty priests. Moreover a new mode of existence, without local extension, is conferred upon the Body of Christ, in addition to the mode which it already possessed in heaven. And the sun shines in at the Church windows, and the tapers burn unconsciously on the altar, and the

flowers shed their fragrance from the vases, while the great mystery is being enacted. But though inanimate nature has not wherewith to suspect it, and though the senses are deceived and penetrate not beyond the sacramental veils, the very miracle of whose continued unsupported existence they are unable to report, the mystery is no secret; the bended knee, the bowed head, the beaten breast, the shrouded face, the instantaneous hush, has revealed that there is not a catholic child in the Church who does not know. and love, and fear, and worship with his heart's heart the transcending mystery of love. The marvel of consecration contains within itself the precious wonder of the Annunciation, and more besides."—Pp. 160-163.

From this close connection between the Infancy of our Saviour and His dwelling in the Tabernacle are very naturally and successfully deduced the devotion to His ever glorious Mother, whose happy privilege it had been to carry in her sacred womb Him whom the very heavens themselves could not contain. From the same fruitful source flow the pious affection and filial veneration with which the faithful of all ages have regarded the Immaculate Mother of Jesus, and loved to dwell with rapturous delight on her uncomparable prerogatives. And whilst thus discussing the claims of the Mother what could be more reasonable than to bestow a grateful and a reverent thought on that blessed Saint, so honoured above all other men as to be entrusted with the care and guardianship of an Infant God? Yes, truly love for Jesus in the Holy Eucharist, where He lies silent and apparently helpless, cannot fail to inspire the contemplative soul with a fond veneration for the great and gifted St. Joseph. And then opens to our view all the hardships and sufferings, all the toils and journeyings in Egypt, in Nazareth and Bethlehem; and even amidst so much of poverty, of dereliction, and of persecution, there shines out that sweet and tranquil enjoyment of the Holy Family grouped together on the wayside, as they sat to rest themselves after all the fatigue of a long day's travelling, or joined in blissful communion in the workshop of Nazareth. All this, and much more does the silent Tabernacle suggest; and exquisitely is each mystery portrayed.

Under the poetical title of "Altar-flowers" Father Faber gives a chapter on the virtues and dispositions which the contemplation of these mysteries, as embodied in the Blessed Sacrament, should call forth and nourish

in the catholic heart. And the special flowers of all devotions to the Blessed Sacrament, and Divine Infancy should be these five—joy, adoration, gratitude, simplicity, and the hidden life. And we positively cannot pass over the following able description of duplicity which is found to pervade the actions and stain the morals of worldly persons, standing out as it does in hideous contrast with the childlike simplicity which the gospel inculcates, and devotion to the Blessed Sacrament fails not to inspire.

“ All around us is hollow and insincere. The world is so in all ages : how eminently must it be so in a time of great luxury and high civilization ! Simplicity is lacking in every department of life. As year glides away after year, it is the great truth which our experience is always teaching, and yet which is ever new to us, because the disappointment is ever raw, that even good people are less true, less frank, less honest, less manly, less noble than we took them to be. We go on trusting, only because it is so intensely miserable not to trust, that we would rather trust and be deceived, than not trust at all. It is the cry which age utters more and more piteously, as time goes on and the hair grows grey, that the beautyfulness of truth is departed from among us. For it is a sort of consolation to believe that the time of youth was a golden age and that the world has worsened since. Alas ! the gilding that we miss was never there : it was only sunshine that we projected from ourselves. It is hard to exaggerate the want of simplicity which is around us. No one is to his dearest friend what he really is. Let us take ourselves the man whom we most love and revere. How little does he know of us ! How little do we let him know of us ! How much we give him to understand which in reality is not true ! We are acting a part before him. We are weighing our words, exaggerating our sympathies, balancing our judgments, toning our minds to his. We would not for the world he should know what we really are. There are whole parts of our character curtained off from his observation. We see where his judgment of us is falsely favourable, but we have not the heart to set him right. We cannot trust the strength of his love in the face of our real vileness. Sometimes we hate ourselves for this very deceitfulness ; it is so intolerable a thing to be loved for the very virtue, of whose opposite vice we are in fact the slaves. If even friendship is thus conventionally, nay, inevitably and blamelessly insincere, what must the less sacred relations of society be ? Take away from social intercourse false praise of others, and half conscious and half unconscious praise of self, and what is left behind ? A hateful refuse of uncharitable judgments of others, and nothing more. In one word, wherever we look and on whatever point we bring our scrutiny to bear, all around us is lie, affectation, and pretence.

Forced sympathies, unreal excitements, imaginary interests, hypocritical enthusiasms, fashionable likings and dislikings, contagious imitations, and a whole significant world of conventional conversation which has not the meaning the language grammatically only would convey—these are the component parts of daily well-mannered intercourse. And how long will even the domestic virtues live and thrive in such a circumambient atmosphere? As to the Name of God, a rude blow would hardly be a coarser surprise than it would be, amid the nicely-adjusted and smoothly-fitting insincerities of the system. What wonder that year after year this greedy gnawing London, into whose den the young generations are thrown successively, should be eating the worth out of men and the very heart out of women?

“ But let us cast an eye at the action of simplicity in the spiritual life. Simplicity lives always in a composed consciousness of its own demerit and unworthiness. It is possessed with a constant sense of what the soul is in the sight of God. It knows that we are worth no more than we are worth in His sight; and while it never takes its eye off that view of self, so it does not in any way seek to hide it from others. In fact it desires to be this, and no more than this, in the eyes of others; and it is pained when it is more. Every neighbour is as it were one of God’s eyes, multiplying His presence; and simplicity acts as if every one saw us, knew us, and judged us, as God does; and it has no wounded feeling that it is so. Thus, almost without direct effort, the sphere of self-love is so narrowed that it has comparatively little room for action; although it can never be destroyed, nor its annoyance ever cease, except in the silence of the grave. The chains of human respect, which in the earlier stages of the spiritual life galled us so intolerably, now fall off from us, because simplicity has drawn us into the unclouded and unsetting light of the Eye of God. There is no longer any hypocrisy. There is no good opinion to lose, because we know we deserve none, and doubt if we possess it. We believe we are loved in spite of our faults, and respected because of the grace which is in us, and which is not our own and no praise to us. All diplomacy is gone; for there is no one to circumvent and nothing to appropriate. There is no odious laying ourselves out for edification; but an inevitable and scarcely conscious letting of our light shine before men, in such an obviously innocent and unintentional manner that it is on that account they glorify our Father who is in heaven. Who would dare to talk of God as laying Himself out to display His own perfections in creation? Nay, He hides Himself; He has to be looked for and found out by all manner of deep thought, unexpected concealments, noiseless disclosures, and delightful surprises. The secrecy of the saints is akin to their simplicity. But this leads me almost at once to our next grace. So that I shall say no more now than that simplicity clothes us from head to foot in Christianlike gracefulness. It gives an unworldly air to all we do,

an astonishing persuasiveness to all we say, and our very silence and inaction have something so celestial about them that they exorcise evil and convert souls."—Pp. 236-239.

The third book is on "The Blessed Sacrament as a picture of God." And it is in this especially that Father Faber has given full scope to fine imaginative and deep devotional feeling. He draws a grand, awe-inspiring picture, indeed. This most ancient, this queen of all mysteries, is handled by him in a manner that shews at once his intimate acquaintance with the sound principles of Catholic theology, as well as his progress in contemplation, so essential to a fit and practical development of this tremendous, fundamental truth. What we admire so much in this very difficult part of the work is the close manner in which the writer follows the writings of the Fathers, the treatises of the great contemplatives of the middle ages, and the works of our most distinguished theologians, such as Father Suarez and Cardinal de Lugo. Under such guidance there could be no fear of stepping aside from the "strait and narrow path" into those fatal bye-ways where many a noble intellect had lost itself irrevocably. But whilst Father Faber borrows his materials from these pure fountains we must do him the justice to say that his moulding and fashioning of them, make them original and delightful. It is, as we have already remarked, no easy task to speak in such terms of a Unity of Essence and Trinity of Persons. And we doubt not but this third book has accomplished it successfully. The depths of the mystery are almost as fully exposed, as human language and finite intellect could hope to effect. There are no technicalities, except those that are so consecrated by usage that their signification cannot be misunderstood. All is suited to the capacity of ordinary readers, whilst the most educated and gifted cannot but be pleased. The application of the leading features of this dread mystery to the Eucharist is inimitable: and the happy demonstration that they are all reflected there as in a faithful mirror. "Especially," remarks Dr. Faber, "does it contain twice three abysses of external operations, into which angels and men desire to look, and yet turn giddy as they gaze, as much because they are sweetly inebriated with the excesses of divine goodness, as because their understanding swims and at

last gives way to extacies in the glory of divine power. These six abysses are predestination, creation, incarnation, justification, transubstantiation, and glorification."

The remaining portion of this book is occupied with the further development of this grand idea. In each of the seven Sections there are very many things which deserve especial attention, even where all is so admirable. The fourth and sixth sections on "God and the Material World," and "God in Theology and in the Church" could be read repeatedly; and each new perusal would both edify and instruct. Father Faber combines deep and extensive theological as well as philosophical knowledge with piety the most exalted and a power of writing the most chaste and beautiful.

We now must content ourselves with a brief allusion to the matter of the fourth and closing book. And one would think that the gifted author had reserved all his varied and wonderful powers for this one effort. "The Blessed Sacrament as a picture of Jesus" is, surely natural and appropriate. But to even ordinary Catholics, as they kneel in solemn and silent adoration before the throne of love, many and many sweet recollections and delightful visions of the life and benignity, the death and love of the Man-God are daily and hourly conjured up; yet, when they come to trace in Father Faber's work the innumerable points of resemblance between the actions and feelings of Jesus during the thirty-three years of his mortal career, and the actions and feelings of Jesus concealed under the consecrated host, they will find that they had, after all, but a poor conception of how much the Blessed Sacrament can do in bringing up before the mind every movement, every wish, every sigh of their divine Lord. This view of the Blessed Sacrament is the one which, in our minds, will be productive of most fruit, at least to the greater number of Catholics. For who, after reading this book, can enter a church, where the Holy Eucharist is kept in the tabernacle, or where the solemn rite of benediction is being performed; or, above all, where the Divine Victim is being offered a Sacrifice, that will not realize to himself at once the living, Presence of the Great Creator—the Redeemer of the universe?

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

I.—*The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, translated into English, by J. DONOVAN, D.D., Ex-Professor, Maynooth College. Author of "Rome, Ancient and Modern," &c. &c. Fourth Edition. Manchester, 1855.

We have long desired to see that invaluable compendium of Catholic Theology, the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, brought out in a style not unworthy of its importance; in an elegant and accurate, yet cheap form; and we are glad to find that our wish has been at length gratified. The above edition of Dr. Donovan's translation, is characterized by great elegance and accuracy. Dr. Donovan had already given several editions of his "Translation," one of which was revised by his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, when Rector of the English, and the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, when Rector of the Irish, College at Rome, printed at the Propaganda Press, and dedicated by permission to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. But, notwithstanding these distinguished recommendations, we still looked for an edition brought closer to the original, and rendered by its cheapness more accessible to our people. The present edition is not only much cheaper, but while it contains exactly the same quantity of matter, in excellent type and paper, is further enhanced by subdivision into chapters and questions, according to the Leipsic stereotype edition of 1841, approved by the Saxon Consistory, and reprinted at the Propaganda Press.

It is hardly necessary for us in addressing our Catholic readers to say a word in commendation of a repertory of Catholic truth so well known and so highly appreciated. To the inquiring Protestant the translator himself, in a graceful and feeling preface, has recommended it so well that we shall transcribe his own words:—

"To another, and happily an increasing, class of the community, the present volume cannot fail to prove an useful acquisition; to those who, anxious only for truth, desire to know the real principles

of Catholics, could they arrive at a knowledge of them through the medium of a compendious and authoritative exposition. Whilst inquiry struggles to burst the bonds in which prejudice and interested misrepresentation have long bound up its freedom, and would still oppress its energies, it would not become Catholics to look on with indifference. We owe it to truth to aid these growing efforts of enlightened reason ; the voice of charity bids us assist the exertions of honest inquiry ; we owe it to ourselves to co-operate in removing the load of unmerited obloquy, under which we still labour ; and, were it possible for us to be insensible to these claims, we owe it to religion to make her known as she really is. To these important ends we cannot, perhaps, contribute more effectually than by placing within the reach of all a work explanatory of Catholic doctrine, and of universally acknowledged authority in the Catholic Church."

In congratulating the Catholic body on the publication of this excellent edition, we should not omit to do justice to the learned and zealous translator against an unworthy attempt upon his interests made by a literary adventurer whom we have met in the same field. Such of our readers as may remember the strictures which, several years since, we felt called on to make upon the wholesale plagiarism of Mr. Waterworth's translation of the *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, practised by the Rev. T. A. Buckley, will perhaps not be surprised to find that the same Reverend gentleman has ventured to repeat the same attempt in reference to Dr. Donovan's translation of the Catechism. In order to express fully the extent of this disgraceful plagiarism it would be necessary to transcribe whole pages of the two translations. It will be enough for us to say that in many cases there is hardly any attempt at concealment of the spoliation ; in others rewriting a sentence, altering single words or phrases, converting active into passive verbs, and other such transparent artifices are resorted to ; and when there is a material variation, it is always to the detriment of the beauty and pureness of the style, and very often to the complete sacrifice of its accuracy. We regret that our narrow limits render it impossible for us to go into the details of the comparison. But we need only refer the reader to the two versions of Part I. *chapter iv. question xi.* ; to *chapter v., question xi.* ; to *chapter vi., question xiv.* ; to Part III. *chapter iv., question xxiv.* ; &c. Some of these mistranslations indeed plainly involve gross theo-

logical errors, and in some cases amount almost to absolute heresy. We noted several of these in pages 216, 262, 254, and elsewhere; but we are reluctantly compelled to content ourselves with referring to them.

We have said enough, and more than enough, to point out that this so-called translation abounds in errors of translation and of doctrine. In truth, no Catholic can conscientiously approve, still less encourage, the circulation of such a work; and, now that we have a Catholic version at once accurate, elegant and cheap, within the reach of all, thanks to the talents, learning, industry and taste of Dr. Donovan, we feel convinced that no caution is necessary against a misnamed translation, abounding in errors philological and doctrinal.

II.—*A Manual of Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.* By the REV. FATHER GAUTRELET, of the Society of Jesus. Translated by a Priest of the same Society. Richardson and Son: London, Dublin and Derby.

Deus non colitur nisi amando, are the words of St. Augustine; and a greater still has taught us that "God is Love." The devotion to the Sacred Heart is, say our approved spiritualists, the worship of love. The material object is the Heart of flesh of the man-God; that Heart which is the principal organ of the natural life, but which in man is also the organ of the moral life and the affections of the soul; not considered as detached from the body to which it communicates life with the blood; nor as separated from the soul which animates it; still less as apart from the Divinity which is united to the body and to the soul of Jesus Christ. Historically, the devotion is the embodiment of the Catholic instinct reacting against the French heresy of the seventeenth century. That heresy sought to darken and to chill; but its final struggle at the pseudo Council of Pistoia was the means of bringing into formally approved practice an antagonist devotion that had virtually existed from the beginning. In our own day it has had opposition to encounter; but it seems destined to be the appointed conqueror of an enemy more dangerous than Jansenism; the worldliness, selfishness, and spiritual sloth of this age. It leads us to the Church's remedy for these mischiefs—the supernatural life of faith

and charity. The present manual we do not presume to criticize. It has long been in extensive use on the Continent, and appears to contain a rich store of instructive and devotional matter; clear and solid argument in the first division;—in the second, the Offices and other devotional exercises sanctioned by lawful authority as the proper nutriment to Christian souls of a tender and active love for the Sacred Heart.

III.—*Florine, Princess of Burgundy: a Tale of the First Crusaders.*
By W. B. MACCABE. Dublin: Duffy, 1855.

The author of the Catholic History, we need hardly say, is perfectly at home in a Tale of the Crusades. It is not alone that he has carefully followed the guidance of history in his narrative; that his leading characters are all historical, and that he has used many of the actual incidents of the memorable expedition of the first crusaders as the groundwork of his plot; he has, besides, contrived to weave them all together into a tale instinct with the Catholic spirit of the time, and with the Catholic feeling of the actors.

We have often expressed our views as to the importance of the historical novel as a medium for the insensible dissemination of religious truth in quarters to which it never could hope to find admittance in any other guise. No one who has mixed at all in general society, can doubt that the judgments which the majority of ordinary readers have formed to themselves of all the great characters in history, are drawn, for the most part, from the pictures of those characters presented in the fashionable novels founded upon their story. The Barons and Churchmen of England are drawn from Scott's *Ivanhoe*, or Bulwer's *Last of the Barons*; and a still wider influence, because ranging over a larger space both in time and in country, has been exercised by the so-called historical novels of Mr. James and his imitators. Catholics alone were late in availing themselves of a means of defence, if not of propagandism, which has been used with terrible effect against themselves.

It was in the consciousness of the evil results of this neglect that Mr. MacCabe undertook his well-known mediæval story, "*Bertha*." "*Florine*" is a less preten-

tious but equally valuable contribution to this department of our literature. We will not attempt to forestall the pleasure of perusal by any analysis of its tale. We will only say that, in dramatic interest, in vividness of description, in vigorous delineation of character, in truth and delicacy of sentiment, above all in genuine Catholic feeling, it is well worthy the high character of an author who has already deserved highly of Catholic history and Catholic literature.

IV. *Thirty Years of Foreign Policy.* A History of the Secretaryships of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston. By the Author of "The Right Hon. B. Disraeli, M.P.," etc. Longmans, 1855.

It is tolerably obvious to men of sense and candour, that the principles of our Foreign Policy for the last thirty years have been essentially one, and the same. Administrative differences have, no doubt, been strongly marked, as the Secretaryship has at one moment employed the judicious gravity of Lord Aberdeen or at another directed the spirited pen of the present Premier; but that individual Ministers, even if they wish to do so, cannot act on very divergent policies in a country where public opinion is the real and ultimate sovereign, is a proposition which we should have thought self-evident enough to be fairly thrown on the world and left to shift for itself. The author of the *Thirty Years*, however, entertains an opposite opinion, and with zeal which if not very wise is, at least, amusing, has set himself to prove it. The result is, a book presenting, as to form, 440 pages of extremely nice readable type; and, as to matter, an eccentric arrangement of many questionable words, alternating for the most part between obscure illustration and argument at once irrelevant and false. It starts from the Spanish Armada and ends at the towers of Sebastopol, the intermediate space being cleverly filled in with "dark windows that exclude the light, and passages that lead to nothing." We have tried very hard, occasionally at least, to catch a view through the one or to force a way through the other, and the attempt has convinced us that whatever failings there may be, the book does enunciate at least one truth, for it has thrown us back continually on the author's open-

